232.12L
W832

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

The Gift of
The Rev. Dr. Thomas Richey

THE MESSIAH

AS PREDICTED IN

The Pentateuch and Psalms;

BEING

A NEW TRANSLATION AND CRITICAL EXPOSITION
OF THESE ANCIENT ORACLES.

By J. R. WOLFE,

AUTHOR OF "THE PRACTICAL HEBREW GRAMMAR."

σπουδάσομεν δὲ ὡς οἷά τε φυγεῖν μὲν τοῦ λόγου τὸ μῆκος
σύντομον δὲ προθεῖναι τοῖς βουλομένοις τὴν ὠφέλειαν.
THEODORET.

LONDON AND GLASGOW:
RICHARD GRIFFIN AND COMPANY,
Publishers to the University of Glasgow.
1855.

Z32.12L
W832.

43784

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

UNION THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Dedication.

TO THE

REV. SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, INDEPENDENT COLLEGE, MANCHESTER,

AND THE

REV. JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE TO THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

TO WHOSE PERSONAL KINDNESSES AND EXCELLENT CRITICAL WORKS

THE AUTHOR IS MAINLY INDEBTED FOR ANY VALUE THAT MAY BELONG TO THIS BOOK,

THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE GRATEFULLY INSCRIBED.

Preface.

This book has been written with the view of furnishing the student of the Bible, in a concise form, with the arguments for the truth of the Christian religion, drawn from the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies.

These prophecies, being the groundwork of our Christian faith—the rudiments of our theology, it is all the more necessary that biblical students should be initiated into a thorough scientific knowledge of them. Unless this be done, though the upper stories are built, the foundation is certainly neglected.

One reason why so many misconceptions prevail upon this subject is to be found in the mystical method of interpretation, and although it be repudiated at present by every intelligent expositor, yet it is to be regretted that we are still—to some extent—oppressed with the haze which it has spread over the field of exegesis.

So long as commentators are able—after the example of Origen and Cocceius—to find Christ directly and per-

sonally in every passage of the Old Testament, and to twist with Rabbinical dexterity the sacred oracles, they feel that they have no need to come down to gather their edification and arguments from a grammatical analysis of the words which the Almighty has been pleased to employ.

The necessity that Christians should attend to this foundation of their faith and hope becomes the more urgent, since the advocates of neology and infidelity are busily at work to undermine it.

As regards the Messianic prophecies interpreted and vindicated in this volume, we build our arguments upon the solid basis of historical-critical interpretation, always endeavouring to keep the middle path between narrow dogmatism on the one hand, and wild conjectures on the other.

We have endeavoured fairly to represent and take cognizance of everything valuable in the voluminous and bewildering treatises of both Rabbinic commentators and German critics, at the same time keeping strictly to our motto, viz., "To make it our study to avoid, as much as possible, prolixity of expression, and to exhibit the useful in a compendious form;" it being our conviction that, diffuseness in works treating of such subjects has the disadvantage at once of wearying the reader, defeating the object in view, and encumbering the combatant in his own armour.

Care has been taken to translate every quotation from the Rabbinical writings which has been given, in order

to induce some to the study of native Hebrew commentary. It is thus hoped that these excerpts may be interesting to those who understand the language, whilst they will not be in the way of others who are not addicted to such pursuits.

A list of the books consulted and referred to, will be found at the end of the work.

We have also to add, that our original intention was to publish an exposition of all the Messianic oracles in the present volume, but having found that the printing of such a book would be too high a venture, we have therefore restricted ourselves at present to the predictions contained in the Pentateuch and Psalms.

It is, in fine, our sincere hope and prayer that this humble contribution to the defence of sacred truth may be the means of strengthening the faith of some, and instructing others who are still strangers to these precious promises.

J. R. W.

Cambridge Street, Glasgow;
October 24, 1854.

PAGE

THE PSALMS QUOTED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT :—

Introductory remarks 123

I. *Metaphrases* :—

1. Psalm viii. 125
2. Psalm xix. 1-7 131
3. Psalm xli. 10 133
4. Psalm lxix. 5, 6 134
5. Psalm lxix. 10 135
6. Psalm cxviii. 22, 23 136

II. *Psalms in which the fundamental idea of a promised Messiah is implied* :—

1. Psalm xl. 1-9 138
2. Psalm lxviii. 143
3. Psalm xcvii. 7 145
4. Psalm xviii. 146
5. Psalm lxxxix. 13-16; and 2 Sam. vii. 12-17 . . 147

Hebrew Poetry in its Relation to Prophecy.

Poetry is said, by Aristotle, to be one of the imitative arts, as painting, sculpture, and music.[1] These arts, though differing among themselves with regard to the means, object, and manner of their imitation, are, nevertheless, based upon the common principle, namely, that they are representations of an image in the mind of the artist, either awakened by some external object, or springing up from within.[2] Of these, poetry may be characterised as the soul and centre. It not only imparts life and inspiration to them all, calling into existence the beautiful and sublime in each, but occupies the most extensive range. The sweet harmony of music, even in its highest achievements, presents but a faint correspondence between the sounds and the objects imitated, having its type solely in the idea of the artist. The sculptor, again, is restricted in the selection of his objects, and, owing to the rigidity of his materials, is excluded from imitating the higher shades of mental expression. The painter, also, even by means of such aids as colour, perspective, and chiaroscuro, which enable him to throw upon the canvas

[1] Its derivation is from ποιεῖν, *to make*; hence ποιητής, ποίησις, and ποίημα.

[2] See Butler's excellent Lectures on Imitative Art, in which he defends Aristotle's definition against Sir J. Reynolds.

such objects as light and air, can exhibit things only by deception, and from a single point of view. The poet is superior to them all. By his winged words, he can imitate and describe objects and actions, in all their aspects and phases. The domain of his imperial art is not limited to visible objects, but is commensurate with the imaginative faculty. Both worlds, of matter and of mind, are at his command. He can describe secret emotions of the most complex character, or, to say with Lessing, "he can give us a picture, of all the slight and secret artifices by which a feeling steals itself into our souls, of all the imperceptible advantages it gains there, of all the stratagems by which it makes every other passion subservient to itself, till it becomes the sole tyrant of our desires and our aversions."[1]

Just as nature and the creative faculty are above imitation, even so is poetry above her sister arts.

However, neither Aristotle, nor any of the ancient rhetoricians have furnished us with a proper definition of poetry; for when we consider the phenomena of language, we find that it is but imitation. "It is the constant working of the mind to embody thought in articulate sounds."[2] All language, therefore, may be characterised as an imitative art, a representation of our conceptions. What we still desiderate, is a definition of poetry, stating not so much its relation to other arts, as drawing a line of demarcation between it and the cognate phenomenon of language, prose composition.

Horace seems to have hit upon the true idea of poetry in distinguishing the poet—

---

[1] Compare Macaulay's Essay on Moore's Life of Lord Byron.

[2] W. von Humboldt, Kavi Sprache auf der Insel Javi, vol. I., p. lvii. He says, again, p. xxvi., "In der Sprache erblückt man das Streben der Idee, der Sprachvollendung Dasein in der Würhlichkeit zu gewinnen."

"Ingenium cui sit, cui mens divinior, atque os
Magna sonaturum."[1]

as one possessing genius, a mind divinely enlightened, and ornate diction. The poet has genius and inspiration, in common with every other artist deserving the name, while his ornate diction distinguishes him from ordinary prose writers.

This, indeed, will be found to constitute an essential characteristic of poetry; for whilst its form varies according to the approved fashion of the nation and the age, the ornate diction, the vivid representation and glowing description, are its essential elements. By elevated diction, we mean that form of expression consisting of living words, which flow spontaneously from the soul of the writer, from the loftiness of his conceptions and intensity of his feelings, which mould and shape themselves into articulate sounds of equal intensity and grandeur. In tracing, therefore, poetry back to its source, and divesting it of the harmonious numbers and all decorations which are merely accessory, we find that it proceeds from sublime conceptions, which kindle in the mind and heart of the poet, and shine brightly through the words in which they are conveyed.

Taking this view of poesy along with us, we consider this to be its ideal, which slights all borrowed charms that dress supplies, and presents itself in its native grandeur, as the unadorned production of the creative mind.

Such an ideal is exhibited to us in the sacred writings of the ancient Hebrews. Their poetry can truly boast with Schiller's muse—

---

[1] Serm., lib. i.; Sat. iii. 1, 43.

"Mich hält kein Band, mich fesselt keine Schranke;
Frei schwing' ich mich durch alle Räume fort.
Mein unermesslich Reich ist der Gedanke,
Und mein geflügelt Werkzeug ist das Wort."[1]

Being free from all the trammels of versification, it is not clogged with the socks or the cothurni, but is strictly the poetry of thought and feeling. It is a poetry without a compeer, like a venerable ancient pyramid, formed by nature herself from huge and living rocks, inimitable by any human architecture.

But as the learned are divided in opinion regarding the form of Hebrew poetry, we proceed to examine some of their views:

I. Philo maintains, not only that Moses was skilled in metrical compositions, but also characterises the prophetic writings as trimetrical.

II. Josephus says, that Moses composed his song at the Red Sea and his parting song in hexameter. In the Psalms of David, also, he recognises odes and hymns *μέτρου ποίκιλου, τοὺς μὲν τριμέτρους τοὺς δὲ πενταμέτρους*[2]

III. The ancient church fathers, Eusebius, Hieronymus, and Origen, adopted the view of these learned Jews, who have not substantiated it by adducing a single example in its favour.

To us, their opinion can, under such circumstances, be of no authority. It arose, most likely, from a vague impression prevalent in those days, that the Bible is not only the standard of faith, but also the code of all sciences

---

[1] "*Die Huldigung der Künste,*" where the above is put into the mouth of Poesy, and may be rendered thus: "No barrier keeps me; no limit restrains me. Freely I wing my flight through all space. Thought, is my boundless domain, and my wings are words."

[2] Archæol., ii. 16, 4; iv. 8, 44; vii. 12, 3.

and arts; hence the endeavour to raise the Hebrew poetry to the dignity of the celebrated poetry of the Greeks.

IV. It was, however, reserved for the learned of the seventeenth century to attempt the restoration of the lost metre; and their failure is owing, not to their want of ability, but to the nature of the case. Among those who engaged in that ungrateful labour, we mention—

a. Franz Gomarus, who wished to establish his hypothesis upon the basis of the masoretic text,[1] and

b. Marc. Meibom, who endeavoured to reach the same result by a new structure of prosody raised upon the ruins of the present vowel system. He has furnished some specimens of his metrical text without producing the rules upon which his system is founded, because he could not find "sex millia curiosorum virorum, qui singuli exemplar, duobus voluminibus in folio editum, recipere vellent pretio quinque librarum Sterlingicarum." The metrical specimens which he presents to the world, are of such a character that every piece of simple prose may as well accommodate itself to it. Such theories, which have been sufficiently refuted by Carpzov and Saalschütz,[2] as well as the similar attempt of Bishop Hare,[3] who has been ably answered by Bishop Lowth,[4] are obsolete, and have no interest except for the antiquarian.

V. More important is the view of Bishop Lowth, advanced in his famous lectures De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum, and in his dissertation on Isaiah, which challenges our particular

---

[1] G. produced an Essay, entitled Davidis Lyra s. nova Hebraeæ Scripturæ ars Poetica, Ludg. Bat., 1637, which has easily been demolished by Lud. Capellus, in his Animadvers. ad novam Davidis Lyram, and gave rise to the pun "Gomari Lyram delirare."

[2] T. L. Saalschütz Von den Formen der Heb. Poesie, Königsberg, 1825, where the various views are given in detail.

[3] Prolegomena in Psalmos.

[4] In an appendix to his Lectures.

attention, not only for the sake of settling the question more immediately at issue, but with a view to the clearing up of a point of higher importance which has incidentally been mixed up with it—we refer to the authority of the Masoretic text.

1. He is of opinion that the Hebrew poetry originally consisted in metre; but in the present state of the language, when the pronunciation is entirely lost to us, it would be a vain attempt to restore that metre. This view is also defended by Carpzov, Jones, Sonntag, and others.

The eminent Prelate builds his theory upon the following foundation:—"Since it is essential to every species of poetry that it be confined to numbers, and consist of some kind of verse (for, indeed, without this it would not only want its most agreeable attributes, but would scarcely deserve the name of poetry), in treating of the poetry of the Hebrews it appears absolutely *necessary to demonstrate* (imposita est necessitas ut ostendat) that those parts at least of the Hebrew writings which we term poetic are in a metrical form, and to inquire whether anything be certainly known concerning the nature and principles of this versification or not."[1]

Now we object to the major proposition in this syllogism. We cannot give our assent to the principle laid down as the basis of his argument—that metre is an essential element of poetry. Upon what law, we may ask, is this assumption founded? Surely, so far as the poetic genius is concerned, no such assertion can be maintained. No one could say that the poetic fire will exhibit itself in the one form or the other. In other words, there is nothing inherent in poetry, that would make it inseparably con-

[1] De Sacr. Poes. Hebr. Lect. iii., translated by G. Gregory.

nected with metre. All that our learned prelate could have meant by this statement is, that, as far as our experience goes with regard to poetry, we find that in most languages, both ancient and modern, poetic composition is generally in metre. But from this analogy nothing can with certainty be deduced; for even supposing that all the Poets with whom we are acquainted had written in measured feet, no prioristic assumption could be formed with respect to the Hebrew Bards, who may, for aught we know, form an exception (though they were the only one), as both their language and the burden of their writings are quite peculiar in their character.

But his position is rendered less tenable, when we find that, the Hebrew does not stand alone in its want of metre, —that those languages to which we must look for an analogy agree in this particular. Thus, the Samaritan and Æthiopic have no other poetic form except that of parallel lines. In Arabic poetry, metre is, according to the highest authorities, of modern invention.[1]

In truth, all that can justly be maintained is, that the poet, by the very nature of his excited feelings and emotions, gives to his words more euphony, more musical cadence and form, than the prose writer. The nature of this form entirely depends upon the character of the poem, as well as in the genius of the nation and their language.

Göthe, in some of his sublimest productions, threw off the restraint of metre, satisfying himself with mere euphony.[2] Even with regard to the Greek poets, to which our Prelate looks up as his model of "harmoniae ac

---

[1] In favour of this view, Pocock (Sp. Hist. Arab., p. 160) pleads the testimony of Alsephad and Jalaloddin.

[2] Comp. Mignon's Todtenfeier in "Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahren," "Prometheus," "Meine Göttin," and some of his other lyrical poems.

poeticae suavitas," it should be borne in mind that "centuries must have elapsed before its development into that grace and elegance, which characterizes the Homeric compositions, and which renders it an object of attraction. The service of the gods, with which everything sublime in the ancient world was connected, from which issued the first rudiments of fine arts—architecture, music, and poetry —must long have consisted in silent actions, expressive gestures, murmuring prayers, and loud cries (ὀλολυγμός), which in later times have been uttered at the sacrifices in honour of the gods.[1] Further, Aristotle himself does not consider metre as an essential element of poetry, when he says that "the epopee alone imitates by *mere words* or *metre*."[2]

And why not release the Hebrew bards from that restriction, who had a higher aim in their writings than to gratify the taste of their hearers (if their taste it were)? who, moreover, wrote in the primitive language in which every word is—as we shall see in the sequel—a concentrated poem, giving us the early analysis of the human thought, describing the throbbings of the infant heart of our race. In such a language we are the more entitled to expect the pure unadorned poetry of emotion, in accordance with the simple life and manners which they depict.

2. In favour of his theory, Bishop Lowth urges the plea that, in many parts of the Hebrew writings, we find some *vestiges of verse*, as also *archaisms*. There are, for instance,

---

[1] Müller, Geschichte der Griech. Liter., I., p. 26. The same, W. v. Humboldt: "Eine so abgerundete Sprache wie die Homerische muss schon lange in den Wogen des Gesanges hin und her gegangen sein, schon Zeitalter hindureh von denen es keine Kunde geblieben ist."—Kavi Spr., I., p. xxi.

[2] This is the opinion of some who thus interpret ἡ δὲ ἐποποιΐα μόνον τοῖς λόγοις ψιλοῖς ἢ τοῖς μέτροις [μιμέοται], De Poetica, γ.

the shortened (apocapated) and lengthened (paragogic) form of certain words, &c. This licence, he thinks, is given only to those writers, who are confined within trammels of versification.[1]

This, however, instead of being the result of pedantry—produced by the restriction of measured feet—may, with more justice, be considered as a licence arising from the sublimity and solemnity of the topic. The impulse of inspiration in its bold flight, struggles with the language—the common vernacular sinks under its glorious conceptions, and, like a sweeping torrent, makes its own channel. To this cause rather, we would ascribe the archaisms and the forms referred to, than to any restriction imposed upon them.

3. But, says Carpzov and Sonntag, the Hebrew poems were sung, as their names מִזְמוֹר[2] and שִׁיר indicate, which could not have been without measured lines.

In reply, we need only refer to the cantillations in the synagogue, where one prose section of the Pentateuch is put to three different tunes, according to the occasion; and —for aught we know—the music of David may have been of the same description. Besides, prose writings may adapt themselves to the most regular and perfect melodies, by the lengthening and shortening of the syllables to suit the tune, as in some popular songs.

4. The only exceptional case which can be made out in favour of a restricted form used by the Hebrew poets is, the acrostic, or alphabetical arrangement of several portions, as *e. g.* in some of the Psalms and in the book of Lamen-

[1] Lect. iii.

[2] Lowth derives מִזְמוֹר from זָמַר, *to cut*, or *prune*, and makes it a plea for versification; but its derivation is more likely from זָמַר, *to sing*. *Vide infra*, Psalm xvi. 1.

tations.[1] In these instances we notice divisions of twenty-two lines, verses or stanzas, according to the letters of the alphabet, the first verse or stanza of which commencing with the letter א, the second with ב, the third with ג, and so on.

But even these instances, instead of supporting the theory of metre, are turning the scale of evidence against it. And it is not a little surprising to find Bishop Lowth adducing this, as the most cogent proof in favour of his hypothesis.[2]

In looking to the Lamentations of Jeremiah, we cannot but perceive that there must be an object higher than mere poetic form and elegance, in its alphabetical arrangement; for it would at once be unnatural and unreasonable to suppose that the Prophet in pouring out his soul in bitter grief for the distress of his nation, in rending the skies with his wailings for the daughter of his people, was at the same time seeking to display an ingenuity, which could be imitated by many a schoolboy. For this phenomenon we must account in some other way than by the poetic form, which, even apart from Divine inspiration, is inconsistent with the character of that book.

It is manifest that there is a higher spiritual aim in this; it has been dictated to the prophet by the spirit of inspiration for assisting the memory[3] of the exiled people—that these heart-stirring graphic images of their past prosperity

---

[1] The sections which occur in that order are Ps. xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxi., cxix., cxlv.; Prov. xxxi. 10-31; Lam. i., ii., iii., iv.

[2] In his Preliminary Dissertation to Isaiah, he says: "We may safely conclude that the psalms perfectly alphabetical consist of verses properly so called; of verses regulated by some observation of harmony or cadence; of measure, number, or rhythm. For it is not at all probable in the nature of the thing, or from examples of the like kind in other languages, that a portion of mere prose, in which number or harmony are totally disregarded, should be laid out according to a scale of division which carries with it such *evident marks of study and labour; of art in the contrivance and exactness in the execution.*"

[3] This fact being admitted by Lowth, why seek for some other solution?

in contrast with their present debasement—may circulate freely—be always present to their minds, and make them think of their past glory and renown—of its waning, and of the promises pointing to their emancipation and return. Thus, every letter of the alphabet brings to their recollection something to awaken their patriotism; reminds them of their sins, the cause of their sufferings.

Similar reasons may have determined the acrostic arrangement of the Psalms referred to.

Moreover, these very forms afford presumptive proofs that the Hebrews were strangers to metre and rhyme. The fact that, when they find necessary to employ any form, they make use of an alphabetical order, which is contrary to all analogy of ancient or modern poets, different from anything we would have anticipated, proves amply that their taste is quite peculiar, and thus cannot be brought into the same category with other species of poetry.

VI. In opposition to the views of Bishop Lowth, and those pleading for Hebrew metre, we have an array of great authorities, who maintain that the Hebrew writers were strangers to such a form of composition, but that their poetry consists in a simple *parallelismus membrorum.*

a. In the book of Cosri, Hebrew poetry is commended for being free from the shackles of verse, and being thereby more calculated to embody sublimity and comprehensiveness of thought, than it could by measured feet.

b. The same view is expressed by Rabbi Asaria in his book מְאוֹר עֵינַיִם, and Sam. Oben Tybon.

c. Among Christian writers, we mention Joseph Scaliger, G. H. Vossius, and Rich. Simon. Among modern, Herder, Ewald, and De Wette. But why rest upon authorities, when we have facts in our favour?

1. We maintain, that the Hebrew writers did not use

metre; as we have no reason to doubt that, had that been the case, we could have found it out. The language is not so much changed and barbarized as Lowth assumes. This is put beyond doubt, by the fact that, the Samaritans, who still exist in the town of Naplous, and who are a mixture of the ten tribes with certain idolatrous nations, pronounce the Hebrew similarly to ourselves.

This nation, since the Babylonish captivity, has lived separately, and in a state of antagonism to the Jews. Their temple and ritual were kept distinct from those of the former, and their agreement—in the pronunciation of the Hebrew—with the Jews, is of great importance. We are able to speak with confidence with regard to it, since a celebrated missionary to the East has made this point a matter of strict investigation, and according to him, the difference between their mode of reading the language, and ours, is scarcely perceptible.[1]

Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when we remember that, though the Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language, its pronunciation was handed down by the Jewish custom, of reading the Pentateuch in the synagogue and teaching the law to their children, which practice to this day is strictly attended to by that nation.

These considerations, then, we conceive, dispose of Bishop Lowth's assertion, that "the pronunciation is entirely

---

[1] Wilson's Land of the Bible, vol. ii., p. 687. "When making inquiry about their method of reading Hebrew, I examined and cross-examined their priest and his son, particularly about their names and powers of the letters, which, according to their account, are as here represented by the following praxis of the first five verses of the first chapter of Genesis:—

"Baráshít bará Elu[w]im at asháinaim waát aáres, waa-ares ayatáh teú ubeú waháshek al fani tuúm uruh Elu[w]im mrahefat ál fani emim u-yaomer Elu[w]im yái ór u-yái ór, uyere Elu[w]im et a'or ki tob wēabdel Elu[w]im bin a-or wabin a-hashek wayikará Elu[w]im láor yom, walaháshek kará líla wayái ereb wayai boher yom aád."

lost and the present a mere modern invention, and hence it would be a vain attempt to restore the lost metre."

2. The metrical form is inconsistent with the spirit and burden of the inspired writings.

The books dictated by the Divine Spirit, are intended for all nations and all ages. The Jewish nation was called to be the bearer and preserver of the divine light to all nations. The oracles delivered to their prophets, are addressed to the whole human family, in all ages. To have put those oracles in metre would have defeated their object, as such a composition cannot be translated into a foreign tongue without a sacrifice of the thought. Is it not natural to expect, that, their poetry would be of such a nature, as not to suffer much by being rendered into another language?

We have dwelt so long, on the question relative to metre in general, and on the view of Bishop Lowth in particular, because it appears to us to be the germ from which sprang the system of Biblical criticism, which we so much deprecate in the German Neologian school, the spirit of which, after having been exorcised from Germany, is now threatening to infest this country and impede the progress of biblical science, through the writings of Parker and his associates.

Strange as it may appear at first sight, that such a point of comparatively subordinate importance, should have given rise to errors of such magnitude, yet it is nevertheless a fact easily demonstrable, when we follow Lowth a step further in his argumentation, and when we consider the account to which his views were subsequently turned by others, who had no fixed principles to guide them in the consideration of such sacred subjects:

After failing to find out Hebrew metre, Bishop Lowth falls back upon the conclusion that "the true pronunciation of the language is totally lost; the rules concerning it which were devised by the modern Jews many ages after the language of their ancestors has fallen into disuse have long been suspected by the learned to be destitute of authority and truth."[1]

By thus setting aside the masoretic text and introducing an arbitrary method of interpretation,[2] a door has been opened to corruption of the Hebrew text, and license given to every one for correcting and amending the inspired writings, to suit every fancy, which could not but be fatal to the interest of sound criticism and interpretation.

That this is the tendency of Bishop Lowth's view, is seen in the fact, that he was the first to take advantage of his own conclusion, and practically to apply the same in his Notes on Isaiah. In that commentary, we meet almost in every page, with critical conjectures and emendations of the text, of the most frivolous kind. Clauses are expunged, words substituted on no other authority but of himself, guided by his subjective taste.

It is foreign to our subject to enter upon a defence of the masoretic text against such wild conjectures, we refer our readers to the excellent work comprising this subject.[3] We are satisfied here with the remark that *primâ facie* it is very unlikely that, the God of revelation would thus leave his book, containing a message to the human race, without certainty or stability. It is opposed equally to

---

[1] Prolect. iii. The futility of this is shown above from the Samaritan reading.

[2] The Hebrew text, without the vowel points, are mere hieroglyphics, which the latter unlock to us. That this vowel system is of Masoretic origin is now sufficiently established.

[3] Davidson, Treatise on Biblical Criticism, I., p. 37 *seq.* and 375-377.

reason as to the ways and dealings of the Almighty, to make his testimony mere guess-work; and yet that system of criticism and interpretation unsettles everything—deprives us of a *locus standi* in the Hermeneutics of the Old Testament.

The influence which the Bishop's Notes on Isaiah had upon the German biblical literature, arose chiefly from the deference paid to his other famous work on Sacred Poesy: for the learned transferred to the one the authority and renown gained by the other; and this influence must be viewed in connexion with the state of letters at the time when that book appeared.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the progress of Biblical science on the basis of belief was disturbed, by the false philosophical system of Hobbes and Spinoza, who meddled also with theological disquisitions, and directed their attacks against some books of the Old Testament, with the view of throwing suspicion on the inspiration and authenticity of the sacred writings. Nothing contributed so much to rouse the generation, thus sunk into the slough of materialism, as the powerful voice of Herder in his famous work, Der Geist. d. Heb. Poesy, which work was the result of his reading Lowth's Lectures,[1]

That work, as well as the latter, inspired them with respect for the Old Testament Scriptures. But they escaped from that position only to fall into another extreme. Taste, and nothing but taste became the watchword and craving of the new school. The Old Testament was indeed treated with the same respect as other literary productions; but the national literature of the Hebrews,

[1] Göthe tells us in his Autobiography, that he met Herder, in Leipzig, when he had just read Lowth's Lectures, of which his mind was quite full.

was the object of investigation, whilst the Christian and Theological interest was totally disregarded.[1] Every sentence was measured by the standard of Greek and Roman beauty; the terms, Hebrew odes, elegies, and dramas, to which Lowth gave currency, received in accession Hebrew mythos, idylle, thus augmenting his scientific nomenclature; and people's minds were trained to confound the holy writings with the heathen literature.[2] Moreover, the subjective taste by which our Prelate was guided in his interpretation and correction of Isaiah—calculated to alarm every sober-minded and enlightened student—gave the key-note to Koppe,[3] and subsequently to Eichhorn, who not only followed his method, but went a step further in calling into question the infallability of the canonical writings. Thus it happens, that the man who drew forth the Hebrew Bible from the dust and rubbish heaped upon it during the dark ages, has by a fatal mistake in seeking to embellish it with the grace and elegance of pagan writers, obscured its sacred glory and native grandeur, and by his license of emendation, sanctioned a method of criticism which involved the most fatal consequences; and to this mistake, he was himself allured, in his search after

---

[1] Compare Hävernick's Einleitung., I. 12 *seq.*, of which there is now an excellent translation by Dr. W. L. Alexander.

[2] Herder, notwithstanding his great admiration for Lowth, "regrets the artificial manner in which he treats the Hebrew writings, and the innovations which he introduced into that venerable poesy, which has been abused by his followers. According to them, David composed the one, (Psalm) Idyll, for amusement, and the other, Elegy, as a school exercise; and the Prophet wrote that lyrical piece as a mere sample of that species of composition. This is a standing point which confounds everything." Theologische Briefe, iii.

[3] There is an important fact noticed by Alexander, in his learned Comm. on Isaiah, viz., that Koppe's edition of "Lowth's Notes" was the work in which the extravagant doctrines of the modern criticism with respect to the unity, integrity, and genuineness of the prophecies were first propounded and applied to the writings of Isaiah. Introd. xlvi., Edit. Dr. Eadie.

Hebrew metre, and by the foregone conclusion with regard to its existence.

Hebrew metre! when we learn duly to appreciate the grandeur of Hebrew poetry, we shall find that this constitutes its additional charm, in being the prompting of mental emotion—the work of nature without the embellishment of art, to stamp it as a production of human ingenuity, but that it bears the impress of its heavenly origin. We see the heart of the prophet heaving with holy emotions, and his mouth pouring forth living, burning words of equal sublimity, free and unrestrained.

It has been noticed above, in our remarks upon poetry in its relation to the imitative arts, that it occupies the most prominent range, being the most perfect of them all. This—so far as other languages are concerned—must be taken with certain limitations. "For," says an eminent critic, "the machinery which the poet employs, consists merely of words, and words cannot, even when employed by such artists as Homer or Dante, present to the mind such images of visible objects, quite as lively and exact as those which we carry away from looking on the work of the brush and the chisel."[1]

It is not the imperfection of the art, but of the materials employed, which put him to such disadvantage. In the language of Dante or Homer, as also in that of Göthe and Shakspeare, words are, for the most part, mere arbitrary terms, standing for certain objects with which they have nothing in common, *i. e.*, they do not convey to the mind, through the ear, an image of the thing they specify. Not so with regard to the language of David and Isaiah; the

[1] Macaulay's Essay on Moore's Life of Lord Byron.

materials at their disposal are peculiarly poetic, so that each word conveys a perfect image to the mind.

Homer, the greatest of artists, sought in several instances to supply the deficiencies of his language by making the sound an echo to the sense; thus in his description of the pestilence, we not only see Apollo descending from Olympus, but we hear the footsteps of the angry God. At each step his shafts resound in his quiver. He moves along like black night—he sets himself at a distance from the fleet—he snaps—his silver bow resounds terribly—his first venomous arrow hits mules and dogs; but soon he directs more deadly ones against the Greeks themselves, and the piles are burning with funerals.[1]

Such a picture surpasses anything that art could exhibit upon the canvass or in the marble; because it is instinct with life and animation; neither can any translation convey the image which moves before our senses in this consummate piece of art. Pope also—following the precept of Longinus and Dionysius—lays down the rules:

---

[1] Βῆ δὲ κατ' οὐλύμποιο καρήνων χωόμενος κῆς,
Τόξ' ὤμισιν ἔχων ἀμφηρεφέα τε φαρέτρην.
Ἐκλαγξαν δ' ἄρ' ὀϊστοὶ ἐπ' ὤμων χωομένοιο
Αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος ὁ δ' ἠΐε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς
Ἕζετ' ἔπειτ' ἀπάνευθε νεῶν, μετὰ δ' ἰον ἕηκε.
Δεινὴ δὲ κλαγγὴ γέινετ' ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο
Οὐρῆας μὲν πρῶτον ἐπώχετο καὶ κύνας ἀργούς
Αὐτὰρ ἐπειτ' αὐτοῖσι βέλος ἐχεπευκὲς ἐφιεὶς
Βάλλ' αἰεὶ δὲ πυραὶ νεκύων καίοντο θαμειαί.—*Iliad*, A, 44-53.

"And from Olympus' lofty tops descends.
Bent was his bow the Grecian heart to wound;
Fierce as he moved his silver shafts resound;
Breathing revenge, a sudden night he spread.
The fleet in view, he twang'd his deadly bow,
And hissing fly the feathered fates below.
On mules and dogs the infection first began,
And last the vengeful arrows fixed in man.
For nine long nights through all the dusky air
The pyres thick flaming shot a dismal glare."—*Pope*.

"'Tis not enough no harshness gives offence,
The sound must be an echo to the sense.
Soft is the strain when zephyr gently blows,
And the smooth stream in smoother numbers flows.
But when loud surges lash the sounding shore,
The hoarse rough verse should like the torrent roar.
When Ajax strives some rock's vast weight to throw,
The line too labours, and the words move slow.
Not so when swift Camilla scours the plain,
Flies o'er the unbending corn, and skims along the main."[1]

These rules he very admirably exemplifies in the very precept, and in his translation of the story of Sisyphus, whose punishment in hades is represented as consisting in his perpetual lifting a stone up a hill, which is no sooner carried to the top of it, but it immediately tumbles to the bottom.[2]

This double motion of the stone is well imitated by his loading the first line with mono-syllables, almost all beginning with aspirates, and heaving up the stone by spondees whilst the last runs down in a continued line of dactyls.[3]

Such imitation by sound, then, does compensate for the imperfection of language. Yet, great poets will make but sparing use of it; for true poesy comes, as it were, through

---

[1] Art of Criticism.

[2] Καὶ μὴν Σίσυφον εἰσεῖδον κρατέρ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα
Λᾶαν βαστάζοντα πελώριον ἀμφοτέρῃσιν
῾Η ὁ μὲν σκιπτόμενος χερσιν τε ποσιν τε
Λᾶαν ἄνω ὤδεσκε ποτὶ λόφον ἀλλ' ὁτε μελλοι
῎Ακρον ὑπερβαλέειν, τότ' αποστρεψασκε κραταιΐς
Αὖτις ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀνειδης.
"I turned mine eye and as I turned survey'd
A mournful vision! the Sisyphian shade.
With many a weary step and many a groan
Up the high hill he heaves a huge round stone.
The huge round stone, resulting with a bound,
Thunders impetuous down, and smokes along the ground."

[3] The last line is far better rendered by the German translator, J. H. Voss:—
"Hurtig hinab mit Gepolter entrollte der tückische Marmor."

a refracting medium, the mind, though it takes, for the most part, a tinge of the emotion also. Hence this exogenous form, cannot, with poetic justice, be called into use, except in descriptions which involve the highest degree of mental excitement. In such cases only the feelings give an impulse to the organs of speech, which appear to pour out words like a rapid torrent urged on by a wave of emotion, in which the mind is but little, if at all, concerned.

The Hebrew language, as hinted above, is peculiarly adapted to convey a living image of the visible world. The Old Testament bards may be styled poets par excellence—not indeed by any display of artificial design and ingenuity, but by that fervour which the breath of Jehovah —whose instruments they are—kindles in their inmost being. Their minds and emotions thus illumined by the Spirit of inspiration become the refracting media, through which the Divine counsels, and messages to the human race are depicted; which images unfold themselves in that which may justly be styled the language of poetry.

These remarks are borne out by the following considerations:—

1. There is no language in which words correspond so much to the ideas they convey, as in Hebrew. This, by the way, may be adduced as an argument in favour of its being the language, or at least a branch of the one, spoken at the dawn of creation by the parents of mankind. The names given to objects and emotions, seem as if suggested by the perceptions and emotions of a child; thus giving us a picture of the primitive condition of the human thought —the impression produced upon men when first opening their eyes upon the world without.

Take, for instance, the vocabulary of an infant. The

first labial sounds which the helpless babe begins to mutter, the Hebrew parents appropriated as names to themselves: thus, father, אָב, abb.; mother, אֵם, emm.[1] The act of talking is called מָלַל, mālăl, whence the Greek λαλεῖν and the German lallen. To publish in the streets, to make a noise, קָרָא, kārā, whence the English "cry" and Greek κράξω. To praise, הָלַל, hālăl, whence the German hallen and Greek ὁλολυγμος. The ear, אֹזֶן, is suggested by its perception of the vibration of sound, *zzz*, whence the name זַמְזֻמִּים, zămzŭmmim, noisy nations, given to a race of giants (Deut. ii. 20). A bottle is called בַּקְבּוּק, bākbūk, from its sound in emitting water. Slippery places, חַלַקְלַקּוֹת, chelāklākkōth, imitates the sound of withdrawing the foot from the mire. To tingle, צַלְצַל, zālzăl. The chirping of a bird, צִפְצַף, zăphzăph. A wheel, or any round thing, גַּלְגַּל, gălgăl, from its rolling. A berry, גַּרְגַּר, gărgăr.

Slow motion is expressed by דָּדָה, dādāh; לָעַט, lāāt; and, to be weary, לָאָה, lāāh; whilst, on the other hand, violent emotions correspond to the harshness of the sound. Thus, when David says לִבִּי סְחַרְחַר,[2] "my heart palpitates," we hear in the word סְחַרְחַר, sechărchăr, the rapidity of the heart's action. Anger is also expressed in רָגַז, rrāgāz, and רָגַשׁ, rrāgash. To slaughter, destroy, do mischief: שָׁחַט, shāchăt; מָחַץ, māchăz; דָּרַק, dārăk; רָעַע, rrāā; and שִׁבֵּר, shibbēr, from which the English, to shiver in pieces.[3]

The gentle breeze is imitated in the word רוּחַ, rrūah; פּוּחַ, pūah; פּוּחַ, pūhā; English, puff; whilst the blast is expressed by גָּעַשׁ, gāāsh; and רָעַשׁ, rrāāsh.

---

[1] These are contractions of ăbbăbă and ĕmmĕmĭ.

[2] Ps. xxxviii. 11.

[3] This applies to the whole piel conjugation, by which intensity is expressed in doubling the middle radical letter.

In the following example we have a thunderstorm and a fair, smiling sky alternately introduced, with such rapid and vivid strokes that cannot fail to delight the reader. The thunder rages with gutturals, whilst the zephyr clears the sky and garnishes the heavens :—[1]

עַמּוּדֵי שָׁמַיִם יְרוֹפָפוּ	The pillars of the heavens tremble :
וְיִתְמְהוּ מִגַּעֲרָתוֹ	They start at his rebuke.
בְּכֹחוֹ רָגַע הַיָּם	By his power he calms the sea :
וּבִתְבוּנָתוֹ מָחַץ רָהַב	By his wisdom he wounds the proud :
בְּרוּחוֹ שָׁמַיִם שִׁפְרָה	By his breath he garnishes the heavens.

If any description can be compared with this it is only the eighteenth Psalm :—

Ver. 8.	וַתִּגְעַשׁ וַתִּרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ	And the earth quaked and trembled,
	וּמוֹסְדֵי הָרִים יִרְגָּזוּ	And the foundations of the mountains rocked.
	וַיִּתְגָּעֲשׁוּ כִּי־חָרָה לוֹ	They were shaken, because he was angry.
9.	עָלָה עָשָׁן בְּאַפּוֹ	A smoke went up from his nostrils,
	וְאֵשׁ מִפִּיו תֹּאכֵל	And fire from his mouth devoured.
	גֶּחָלִים בָּעֲרוּ מִמֶּנּוּ	Burning coals shot forth from him.
10.	וַיֵּט שָׁמַיִם וַיֵּרֶד	He bowed the heavens and came down ;
	וַעֲרָפֶל תַּחַת רַגְלָיו	And darkness was under his feet,
11.	וַיִּרְכַּב עַל־כְּרוּב וַיָּעָף	And he rode upon a cherub and did fly :
	וַיֵּדֶא עַל כַּנְפֵי־רוּחַ	He came flying upon the wings of the wind.

Now, mark the transition from the swift gentle motion to the roaring of the thunder in—

Ver. 14.	וַיַּרְעֵם בַּשָּׁמַיִם יְהוָה	Jehovah thundered in the heavens,
	וְעֶלְיוֹן יִתֵּן קוֹלוֹ	And the Most High utters his voice ;
	בָּרָד וְנַחֲלֵי אֵשׁ	Hailstone and coals of fire.

[1] Job xxvi. 9-14.

2. There is another peculiarity about the Hebrew which renders it eminently poetic, namely, that almost all words, even particles, with few exceptions, are derived from verbs, whose radix they still retain; hence the idea of activity—forming as it does the principal materials of the language—is suggested to us in every part of speech.

What is true of every genuine epic poem—that its chief effect is produced by our losing sight of the writer, and being introduced to the company of his heroes, witnessing the plot, and becoming ourselves personally interested in its progress—is, within certain limits, applicable to this language, whose materials consist, not of dead matter, but of living agents. Every word passing before our eyes says, "I live, move, and act."

We are told that the Lord brought all the new created things to Adam, to give them names.[1] Now, with regard to Adam's nomenclature, we notice the idea of action associated with each object. The horse, סוּס, sūs, so called from its leaping; ox, שׁוֹר, shōr, from his strength and boldness; bird, צִפּוֹר, zippōr, from its chirping; the bee, דְּבוֹרָה = דָּבַר, from its constant humming; serpent, נָחָשׁ, nāchāsh, from its hissing. The social domesticated animals he called בְּהֵמָה, dumb, *i. e.*, he could well associate with them, but for the want of that divine gift—speech, to render them fit companions.

The bright luminary which rules the day is called שֶׁמֶשׁ, from שָׁמַשׁ, to serve, which is expressive of the fact that, with all his majestic splendour, he is still a mere servant, doing the bidding of that King who has fixed and upholds him in his sphere.

These words, therefore, are not, as in other languages,

[1] Gen. ii. 19.

inert, but active. The horse leaps, the serpent hisses, the bee hums, the bird chirps, even the stone, אֶבֶן, acts, viz., it offers resistance to our grasp, being derived from אָבַן; Arab. ابن, to be hard.[1]

The name of man himself, אָדָם, Adam, was given to him, as the Historian explains it, because he was taken, עָפָר מִן הָאֲדָמָה, dust from the ground. His very name, therefore, reminds him of that awful sentence, "Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return."[2]

3. Another poetic element of its structure we mention is the extreme brevity and comprehensiveness of its diction. Hebrew words are "full of pith and moment." One word is at once subject, predicate, object, copula, preposition, &c., and is worth six or seven English; as קָדַשְׁתִּיךָ, I am holier than thou; חֲזַקְתַּנִי, thou art stronger than I; וְהִנְחַלְתִּיךָ, and I shall cause thee to inherit, &c.

What power is there in a language in which we do not dismember a sentence into small fragments—into little particles and auxiliary verbs—but where a single word brings a complete image—a whole narrative—before our minds; so that we are reminded more of deciphering hieroglyphics than reading, in the common acceptation of the term. The primary conception of the sentence is put in the root, around which all the members cluster with precision and regularity—like stem, branches, and leaves—constituting a perfect organism. In allusion to this peculiarity of the language, Herder remarks, "the Hebrews remind us of children, who wish to say everything at once."

---

[1] Gesenius derives it from בָּנָה, to build, but it received the name before it was employed as a material of architecture.

[2] Gen. iii. 19.

With such language, then—which is itself poetry—the Hebrew writers did not need the assistance of metre, or any species of artificial decorations and display, to give their more elevated compositions a poetic colouring.

From what has been said, it will be understood that we do not contend against all forms in the Hebrew poetry; our objections being directed solely against the notion of seeking in the Hebrew a studied, artificial arrangement, than which nothing can be more contrary to its majestic simplicity and import. But, on the other hand, we admit a structure and form which follow the laws of an organization founded in the nature of the human mind. In thus contemplating upon the sublime compositions of the Hebrew oracles, we are inspired with a feeling of pleasure akin to that which we derive from looking upon the everlasting hills, whilst Nature around us is arrayed in all her vernal beauty and loveliness, and are ready to exclaim:

"Gerechtestes Gesetz! dass Kraft sich Zier gemähle
In einem schönen Leib wohnt eine schöne seele."[1]

It is not our object, at present, to enter upon a consideration of the sublimity of expression, and all those poetic forms which are incidental to every elevated composition—as allegory, comparison, prosopopoeia, and personification—to exhibit the lustre and charm with which they invest the Hebrew writings in particular; these topics should be familiar to every student, since they are so ably discussed in Bishop Lowth's Lectures; as also the testimony of that competent judge is valuable, viz., "as some of those writings exceed in antiquity the fabulous ages of Greece, in sublimity they are superior to the most finished productions of that polished people."

[1] Albr. v. Haller's famous poem "Die Alpen."

We shall confine our attention here only to those forms which may be regarded as strictly the peculiar characteristic features of Hebrew poetry. These are, namely, I. Paranomasia and II. Parallelism.

I. *Paranomasia*

Is a figure of speech, consisting in the collocation or juxtaposition of two or more words of similar sound, whilst in sense they are either synonymous, antithetic, or varied. It is employed chiefly in poetic compositions for the purpose of adding to the force and beauty of the sentences.

a. Synonymous are, *e. g.*, וַתִּגְעַשׁ וַתִּרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ, "and the earth shook and trembled," Ps. xviii. 18. הַבּוֹק תִּבּוֹק הָאָרֶץ וְהִבּוֹז תִּבּוֹז, "The land shall be utterly emptied and utterly spoiled," Is. xxiv. iii. יֵקַד יְקֹד כְּיקֹד אֵשׁ, "He shall kindle a burning like a burning of fire," Is. x. 16. וְנָהָה נָהִי נְהִיָה, "And he shall lament with a doleful lamentation," Micah ii. 4. בּוּקָה וּמְבוּקָה וּמְבֻלָקָה, "Empty, void, and desolate," Nah. ii. 11. To these may be added those instances where the name suggests its historic relation, as בָּתֵּי אַכְזָב לְאַכְזָב, "The houses of Achezeb shall become a lie," Micah i. 4. יַפְתְּ אֱלֹהִים לְיֶפֶת, "The Lord shall enlarge to Japheth," Gen. ix. 27. יְהוּדָה אַתָּה יוֹדוּךָ אַחֶיךָ, "Judah, thou! thy brethren shall praise thee," Gen. xlix. 8.

b. Antithetic are exemplified in the following: לָתֵת לָהֶם פְּאֵר תַּחַת אֵפֶר, "To give them beauty for ashes," Is. lxi. 3. וַיְקַו לְמִשְׁפָּט וְהִנֵּה מִשְׂפָּח לִצְדָקָה וְהִנֵּה צְעָקָה, "He looked for judgment, and behold bloodshed; for righteousness, and behold a cry," Is. v. 7.

c. Of varied signification are such as פַּחַד וָפַחַת וָפָח, "fear pit and snare," Is. xxiv. 17. וְשִׁלַּחְתִּי לְבָבֶל זָרִים וְזֵרִיתָהּ,

"And I shall send to Babylon strangers, who shall scatter her," Jer. li. 2.

This figure, which is in some instances a kind of play upon words, is no artificial mode of speaking, but has its foundation in the constitution of the human mind, which, when highly excited, seeks to express its ideas and emotions by the very sound. The organs of speech, also, under the impulse of an excited mind, or—to be more mechanical—by the impetus of their sensori-motor nerves, are under an impediment to modulate, but rush on, in one direction. Hence arise such phrases as בּוֹקָה וּמְבוּקָה וּמְבֻלָּקָה and פַּחַד וָפַחַת וָפָח, &c.

The force and beauty of such expressions is seen from the fact, that they are employed by the best ancient and modern poets and orators, as Virgil, Terence, Sophocles, Cicero, Petrarch, Shakspeare, and Milton,[1] though by no means to the same advantage as the Hebrews.

The last-mentioned poet, indeed, has been censured by one of his greatest admirers for the frequent use of this figure. Among the faults of Milton's style, Addison reckons this, "that he often affects a kind of jingle in the words, as in the following passages and in many others:—

> "'And brought into the world a world of woe.'
> "'Beseeching or besieging,
> "'This tempted our attempt.'
> "'At one slight bound might overleap all bound.'

"and the like. I know that there are figures of this kind of speech, that some of the greatest antients have been guilty of it, and that Aristotle himself has given it a place in his Rhetoric among the beauties of that art; but as it is

[1] See Barnes' Philological Grammar, p. 225 *seq.*; also Schlegel's Dramatic Literature, Lect. xxiv.

in itself poor and trifling, it is, I think, at present universally exploded by all the masters of polite writing."[1]

Whether it was mere affectation in Milton, or whether he followed in this, as in every other particular of his great epic, the promptings of higher laws than those laid down by polite critics, we may leave for Addison and Macaulay to determine; this, however, is certain, that with the Hebrew writers it was no affectation, but sprung from that fundamental law referred to which is rooted in the human mind, and is superior to arbitrary laws of any school of rhetoricians. Even those instances of play upon words which may appear childish, and therefore as savouring of affectation in others, to the Hebrews it is natural to evince a peculiarity of children; it fits their age, and renders their language the more forcible and emphatic. But the principal feature of the Hebrew poetry is

Parallelism.

When we come nearer to examine the difference between the poetry of nature and prose, we find that it consists in this, namely, that the poet or prophet rises with the greatness and sublimity of his theme above the level of ordinary prose composition. His tone becomes more animated, solemn, and sententious. The transition from prose to poetry is apparent from the very tone and cadence of the language; we feel it, so to say, in the air we breathe. We feel just as if we were leaving the plain and entering upon a grand and picturesque scenery, where the fields wave with corn and the hills with vines, and the rivers make glad the city of God; or amidst the eternal

[1] Spectator, No. 279.

mountains, whose cedars are shaken by the breath of Jehovah, and where the wheels of his fiery chariot are thundering in the heavens; in a word, we hold communion with Nature herself in all her aspects and phases.

The book of Job furnishes a striking example. Who can mistake the transition from the second to the third chapter? In the former, we have a plain consecutive narrative of patriarchal life and rural enjoyment, but no sooner do we enter upon the words "and Job opened his mouth, and cursed his day," than we find ourselves, like Lear, lonely, in a dark, dreary, and terrific night, when Nature is rocking at its very centre, and instant ruin and chaos threatening to come back again.

Prose is like a calm sea, rushing onward in its course without interruption; whilst poetry is the sea in a tempest, where wave calls unto wave; and these sweeping billows are called parallelism. In it, we have a kind of paranomasia of sentences, with the only difference that it is not, like the latter, owing partly to a mechanical cause, but is effected by causes purely emotional; it is entwined with the heart of the writer; his very soul being filled with the subject; his heart—to use a Hebrew phrase—רָחַשׁ לֵב, labours with the theme, boils up a short sentence full of vital power. But instead of proceeding with the thread of the discourse, he recurs to the same sentiment, repeats it in other words or develops it; turns it over and presents it from a different point of view, to give assurance of its reality. We accordingly obtain three kinds of parallelisms, viz.:—

I. *Synonymous*, in which the second clause is an echo to the first.

II. *Antithetic*, in which the second is the converse of the first.

III. *Synthetic*, in which the idea expressed in the first clause is further developed in the following.

I. *Synonymous Parallelisms* are:—

1. When the first hemistich exhausts the idea of the sentence, and the second is a mere repetition, an echo of the same sentiment in different language. The change is either in the noun or verb, or in both, as—

עָדָה וְצִלָּה שְׁמַעַן קוֹלִי	Adah and Zilla, hear my voice;
נְשֵׁי לֶמֶךְ הַאְזֵינָה אִמְרָתִי	Ye wives of Lamech, hearken to my speech:
כִּי אִישׁ הָרַגְתִּי לְפִצְעִי	For I have slain a man because of my wounding;
וְיֶלֶד לְחַבֻּרָתִי	A young man because of my hurt.—Gen. iv. 23.
כִּי בְלֵיל שֻׁדַּד עָר מוֹאָב נִדְמָה	That in a night the capital of Moab is plundered, destroyed;
כִּי בְלֵיל שֻׁדַּד קִיר־מוֹאָב נִדְמָה	That in a night the city of Moab is plundered, destroyed.—Is. xv. 1.
בְּנִי אִם־עָרַבְתָּ לְרֵעֶךָ	My son, if thou be surety for thy friend,
תָּקַעְתָּ לַזָּר כַּפֶּיךָ	If thou hast given thy hand for a stranger,
נוֹקַשְׁתָּ בְאִמְרֵי פִיךָ	Thou art snared by the words of thy mouth,
נִלְכַּדְתָּ בְּאִמְרֵי־פִיךָ	Thou art caught by the words of thy mouth.—Prov. vi. 1, 2.

2. When the thought is divided into two parts, and the whole is expressed either simply positive, as—

יוֹם לְיוֹם יַבִּיעַ אֹמֶר	Day unto day poureth forth speech,
וְלַיְלָה לְלַיְלָה יְחַוֶּה־דָּעַת	And night unto night speaketh knowledge.—Ps. xix. 3.

Or, positive in the one, and negative in the other clause, as—

נְצֹר בְּנִי מִצְוַת אָבִיךָ — Keep, my son, the commandment of thy father,
וְאַל תִּטֹּשׁ תּוֹרַת אִמֶּךָ — And forsake not the law of thy mother.—Prov. vi. 20.

This would be, in prose, "Obey thy father and mother."

3. The verse is sometimes thus divided, that one member contains one idea more than the other. Either the second receives only a part of the first, in which case it is a mere appendage to the former, as—

מַמְלְכוֹת הָאָרֶץ שִׁירוּ לֵאלֹהִים — Sing unto God, ye kingdoms of the earth,
זַמְּרוּ אֲדֹנָי — Sing praises to the Lord.—Ps. lxviii. 33.

שַׁתָּ עֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ לְנֶגְדֶּךָ — Thou hast placed our sins before thee,
עֲלֻמֵנוּ לִמְאוֹר פָּנֶיךָ — Our secret (sins), in the light of thy countenance.—Ps. xc. 8.

שַׂמְּחֵינוּ כִּימוֹת עִנִּיתָנוּ — Make us glad according to the days thou hast afflicted us,
שְׁנוֹת רָאִינוּ רָעָה — The years wherein we have seen evil.—Ps. v. 15.

Or the second completes and determines the sense of the first, as—

אֵל נְקָמוֹת יְהוָה — God of vengeance, Jehovah;
אֵל נְקָמוֹת הוֹפִיעַ — God of vengeance, shine forth!—Ps. xciv. 1.

II. *Antithetical Parallelisms* are those whose second hemistich is strictly the converse of the first, as—

כִּי מְרֵעִים יִכָּרֵתוּן — For evil doers shall be cut off;
וְקֹוֵי יְהוָה הֵמָּה יִרְשׁוּ־אָרֶץ — But they who wait upon the Lord shall inherit the earth.

וְעוֹד מְעַט וְאֵין רָשָׁע — For yet a little, and the wicked is not;
וְהִתְבּוֹנַנְתָּ עַל־מְקוֹמוֹ וְאֵינֶנּוּ — Thou shalt look upon his place, and he is not.

וַעֲנָוִים יִירְשׁוּ־אָרֶץ — But the meek shall inherit the earth,
וְהִתְעַנְּגוּ עַל־רֹב שָׁלוֹם — And delight themselves in the abundance of peace.—Ps. xxxvii. 9, 10.

הֵמָּה כָרְעוּ וְנָפָלוּ — They kneel and fall;
וַאֲנַחְנוּ קַמְנוּ וַנִּתְעוֹדָד — But we rise and stand.—Ps. xx. 9.

III. The *Synthetic Parallelisms* are various: the second member either simply continues the thought, supplements, or illustrates it by comparison, as—

כְּנֶשֶׁר יָעִיר קִנּוֹ — As an eagle stirreth up her nest,
עַל גּוֹזָלָיו יְרַחֵף — Fluttereth over her young,
יִפְרֹשׂ כְּנָפָיו יִקָּחֵהוּ — Spreadeth out her wings, taketh them,
יִשָּׂאֵהוּ עַל־אֶבְרָתוֹ — Beareth them on her wings.—Deut. xxxii. 11.

בְּיָדְךָ אַפְקִיד רוּחִי — Into thy hand I commit my soul.
פָּדִיתָה אוֹתִי יְהוָה אֵל אֱמֶת — Thou hast redeemed me, Jehovah God of truth.—Ps. xxxi. 6.

כְּאַיָּל תַּעֲרֹג עַל־אֲפִיקֵי־מָיִם — As the hart panteth after the water brooks,
כֵּן נַפְשִׁי תַעֲרֹג אֵלֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים — So my soul panteth after thee, O God!
צָמְאָה נַפְשִׁי לֵאלֹהִים לְאֵל חָי — My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God.
מָתַי אָבוֹא וְאֵרָאֶה פְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים — When shall I come and appear before God?—Ps. xlii. 1, 2.

אָנָה אֵלֵךְ מֵרוּחֶךָ — Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
וְאָנָה מִפָּנֶיךָ אֶבְרָח — And whither shall I flee from thy presence?
אִם אֶסַּק שָׁמַיִם שָׁם אַתָּה — If I ascend into heaven, thou art there!
וְאַצִּיעָה שְׁאוֹל הִנֶּךָּ — If I make my bed in hades, behold, thou art there!

אֶשָּׂא כַנְפֵי־שָׁחַר	Should I take the wings of the morning,
אֶשְׁכְּנָה בְּאַחֲרִית יָם	And dwell in the remotest parts of the sea,
גַּם־שָׁם יָדְךָ תַנְחֵנִי	Even there shall thy hand lead me,
וְתֹאחֲזֵנִי יְמִינֶךָ	And thy right hand shall hold me!
וָאֹמַר אַךְ חֹשֶׁךְ יְשׁוּפֵנִי	If I say surely the darkness shall conceal me,
וְלַיְלָה אוֹר בַּעֲדֵנִי	Even the night is light about me.
גַּם־חֹשֶׁךְ לֹא יַחְשִׁיךְ מִמֶּךָּ	Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee;
וְלַיְלָה כַּיּוֹם יָאִיר	But the night shineth as the day:
כַּחֲשֵׁיכָה כָּאוֹרָהּ	Both darkness and light are alike unto thee!

Parallels, however, are not restricted to two lines.

One verse, or strophe, may consist of three or more lines, which either expand and develop the same idea throughout, or form an antithesis to each other, or, most frequently, are progressive.

a. Verses of three lines are—

יִרְדֹּף אוֹיֵב נַפְשִׁי וְיַשֵּׂג	Let the enemy pursue me and seize,
וְיִרְמֹס לָאָרֶץ חַיָּי	And tread down my life to the earth,
וּכְבוֹדִי לֶעָפָר יַשְׁכֵּן	And lay mine honour in the dust. —Ps. vii. 7.
יֵבֹשׁוּ וְיַחְפְּרוּ יַחַד מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשִׁי לְסִפּוֹתָהּ	Let those be ashamed and confounded together who seek my life to destroy it;
יִסֹּגוּ אָחוֹר וְיִכָּלְמוּ חֲפֵצֵי רָעָתִי	Let those be driven back and be ashamed who wish me ill.
יָשֹׁמּוּ עַל־עֵקֶב בָּשְׁתָּם הָאֹמְרִים לִי הֶאָח הֶאָח	Let those be desolate for their shame who say to me, Aha, aha!—Ps. xl. 15.

b. Verses of four lines are—

כִּי כָאָרֶץ תּוֹצִיא צִמְחָהּ — For as the earth bringeth forth its shoots,
וּכְגִנָּה זֵרוּעֶיהָ תַּצְמִיחַ — And the garden causes its seed to spring up;
כֵּן אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה יַצְמִיחַ צְדָקָה — So does the Lord Jehovah cause righteousness to spring up,
וּתְהִלָּה נֶגֶד כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם — And praise before all nations.—Is. lxi. 11.

אִם־תֹּאבוּ וּשְׁמַעְתֶּם — If ye consent and obey,
טוּב הָאָרֶץ תֹּאכֵלוּ — The good of the land shall ye eat;
וְאִם־תְּמָאֲנוּ וּמְרִיתֶם — But if ye refuse and rebel,
חֶרֶב תְּאֻכְּלוּ — By the sword shall ye be eaten.—Is. i. 19.

c. Verses of five lines are—

אַחַת שָׁאַלְתִּי מֵאֵת־יְהוָה — One thing I desire from Jehovah;
אוֹתָהּ אֲבַקֵּשׁ — This I will seek after;
שִׁבְתִּי בְּבֵית־יְהוָה כָּל יְמֵי חַיַּי — To sit in the house of Jehovah all the days of my life,
לַחֲזוֹת בְּנֹעַם יְהוָה — To behold the beauty of Jehovah,
וּלְבַקֵּר בְּהֵיכָלוֹ — And to inquire in his temple.—Ps. xxvii. 4.

הַבַּנְּהָרִים חָרָה יְהוָה — Is Jehovah's anger kindled against the rivers?
אִם בַּנְּהָרִים אַפֶּךָ — Is thy wrath against the rivers?
אִם בַּיָּם עֶבְרָתֶךָ — Is thy indignation against the floods,
כִּי תִרְכַּב עַל־סוּסֶיךָ — That thou ridest on thy horses,
מַרְכְּבֹתֶיךָ יְשׁוּעָה — Upon the chariots of victory?—Habak. iii. 8.

d. Verses of six lines are, *e. g.*—

אֶרְאֶנּוּ וְלֹא עַתָּה — I see him, but not now;
אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ וְלֹא קָרוֹב — I behold him, but not nigh.

דָּרַךְ כּוֹכָב מִיַּעֲקֹב	A star proceedeth from Jacob,
וְקָם שֵׁבֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל	And a sceptre rises from Israel,
וּמָחַץ פַּאֲתֵי מוֹאָב	And smites the corners of Moab,
וְקַרְקַר כָּל־בְּנֵי שֵׁת	And destroyeth all the sons of tumult.—Num. xxiv. 17.
אִתִּי מִלְּבָנוֹן כַּלָּה	With me, from Lebanon, spouse,
אִתִּי מִלְּבָנוֹן תָּבוֹאִי	With me, from Lebanon, thou shalt come.
תָּשׁוּרִי מֵרֹאשׁ אֲמָנָה	Thou shalt look from the top of Amana,
מֵרֹאשׁ שְׂנִיר וְחֶרְמוֹן	From the top of Shenir and Hermon,
מִמְּעֹנוֹת אֲרָיוֹת	From the lions' dens,
מֵהַרְרֵי נְמֵרִים	From the mountains of leopards.

c. One line may constitute an entire verse, especially in the middle of a poem, *e. g.*—

קוֹל־יְהוָה חוֹצֵב לַהֲבוֹת אֵשׁ	The voice of Jehovah heweth flames of fire.—Ps. xxix. 7.

where a powerful effect is produced by the brevity of the sentence, as well as by the words, which imitate the rapid glare of lightning.

Perfect and Imperfect Parallelism.

A parallelism is called perfect when all members consist of an equal number of words, and imperfect, when one member is shorter than the rest. The greater number of parallels are of equal length, but sometimes one member is considerably shorter than the rest; which contrast not only relieves the monotony, but generally contains something peculiarly striking; it is a condensation of thought giving additional momentum.

Perfect parallelism is, *e. g.*—

תִּמְשׁוֹךְ לִוְיָתָן בְּחַכָּה	Canst thou draw leviathan with a hook?
וּבְחֶבֶל תַּשְׁקִיעַ לְשׁוֹנוֹ	And bridle his tongue with a cord?
הֲתָשִׂים אַגְמוֹן בְּאַפּוֹ	Canst thou put a hook into his nose?
וּבְחוֹחַ תִּקּוֹב לֶחְיוֹ	Or bore his jaw with a thorn?
הֲיַרְבֶּה אֵלֶיךָ תַּחֲנוּנִים	Will he make many supplications to thee?
אִם־יְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ רַכּוֹת	Will he speak soft words to thee?
הֲיִכְרֹות בְּרִית עִמָּךְ	Will he make a covenant with thee?
תִּקָּחֶנּוּ לְעֶבֶד עוֹלָם	Wilt thou take him for a perpetual servant?—Job iv. 25-29.

Imperfect parallelism is exemplified in the following—

בִּשַּׂרְתִּי צֶדֶק בְּקָהָל רָב	I have proclaimed righteousness in the great congregation.
הִנֵּה שְׂפָתַי לֹא אֶכְלָא	Lo, I have not refrained my lips,
יְהוָה אַתָּה יָדָעְתָּ	Jehovah, thou knowest.—Ps. xl. 10.
מִי יִתֵּן טָהוֹר מִטָּמֵא	Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?
לֹא אֶחָד	Not one!—Job xiv. 4.
שְׁאוֹל מִתַּחַת רָגְזָה לְךָ	Hell from beneath is roused at thee
לִקְרַאת בּוֹאֶךָ	To meet thee at thy arrival.
אוֹרֵר לְךָ רְפָאִים	It rouses for thee the giants,
כָּל עַתּוּדֵי אֶרֶץ	All the chiefs of the earth.
הֵקִים מִכִּסְאוֹתָם	It roused from their thrones
כָּל מַלְכֵי גוֹיִם	All the kings of the nations.
כֻּלָּם יַעֲנוּ וְיֹאמְרוּ אֵלֶיךָ	All answer and say unto thee,
גַּם־אַתָּה חָלִית כָּמוֹנוּ	Thou also art made weak as we?
אֵלֵינוּ נִמְשַׁלְתָּ	Art thou like ourselves?—Is. xiv. 9-11.

These are the principal classifications which have been attempted with regard to the different kinds of Hebrew rhythm or parallelism, In a practical point of view, we do not deem them of any considerable importance. Indeed, it may be questioned whether we would obtain new light upon the Old Testament Scriptures by devising an additional number of rules to form an exclusive poetic for the Hebrew bards. Such a poetry as that of the Hebrews cannot conveniently be confined within certain trammels. All such attempts it meets with the reply of David, when asked to put on the coat of mail and the helmet of brass, "I have not been accustomed to these."[1]

There are some poems which cannot be brought under any of the parallelisms, being strictly progressive in their character, owing to the nature of the theme.

Isaiah's prophetic description of Sennacherib's invasion of Jerusalem may serve as an example—

בָּא עַל־עַיָּת	He is come to Aiath,
עָבַר בְּמִגְרוֹן	He is passed to Migron;
לְמִכְמָשׂ יַפְקִיד כֵּלָיו	To Michmash he transports his baggage;
עָבְרוּ מַעְבָּרָה	They have passed the straits;
גֶּבַע מָלוֹן לָנוּ	In Geba they have taken up their night quarters:
חָרְדָה הָרָמָה	Remah trembles;
גִּבְעַת שָׁאוּל נָסָה	Gibath Saul is fled.
צַהֲלִי קוֹלֵךְ בַּת־גַּלִּים	Cry aloud, daughter of Gallim;
הַקְשִׁיבִי לַיְשָׁה	Harken, Laisha;
עֲנִיָּה עֲנָתוֹת	Ah, poor Anathoth!
נָדְדָה מַדְמֵנָה	Madmena wanders;

[1] 1 Sam. xvii. 39.

יוֹשְׁבֵי הַגֵּבִים הֵעִיזוּ	The inhabitants of Gebim gather themselves.
עוֹד הַיּוֹם בְּנֹב לַעֲמֹד	Yet to-day he is to stand in Nob,
יְנַפֵּף יָדוֹ הַר בַּת צִיּוֹן	And shake his hand against the mountain of the house of Zion,
גִּבְעַת יְרוּשָׁלָם	The hill of Jerusalem.—Is. x. 28-33.

Eliphaz's vision of the spectre, also, is a piece of composition *sui generis*, and may be considered as the most sublime description extant—

וְאֵלַי דָּבָר יְגֻנָּב	And to me a word came stealthily,
וַתִּקַּח אָזְנִי שֵׁמֶץ מֶנְהוּ	And mine ears received a whisper thereof.
בְּשִׂעִפִּים מֵחֶזְיוֹנוֹת לָיְלָה	In thoughts from night-visions,
בְּנָפֹל תַּרְדֵּמָה עַל־אֲנָשִׁים	When deep sleep falls on men,
פַּחַד קָרָאַנִי וּרְעָדָה	Terror came upon me, and trembling,
וְרֹב עַצְמוֹתַי הִפְחִיד	And made all my bones shudder.
וְרוּחַ עַל־פָּנַי יַחֲלֹף	A spirit passed before me;
תְּסַמַּר שַׂעֲרַת בְּשָׂרִי	The hairs of my flesh stiffened—
יַעֲמֹד	There it stood—
וְלֹא אַכִּיר מַרְאֵהוּ	But I did not discern its form—
תְּמוּנָה לְנֶגֶד עֵינָי	An image before mine eyes—
דְּמָמָה	Silence—
וָקוֹל אֶשְׁמָע	And I hear a voice:
הַאֱנוֹשׁ מֵאֱלֹהַּ יִצְדָּק	Is a mortal more just than God?
אִם־מֵעֹשֵׂהוּ יִטְהַר גָּבֶר	Is man purer than his Maker?—Job. iv. 12-17.

We call this a unique piece of composition, because no description of a midnight apparition, or spectre, which has ever been attempted can for a moment be compared with this life-like phenomenon. Dante is the most famous poet for such descriptions. Amidst such scenes and

visions he is quite at home, as Gulliver among his philosophizing horses. Yet his power consists chiefly in this, that he makes us for the moment forget the company we are in—he invests his spirits with bones and muscles.

Homer, or rather—as critics now generally agree—his interpolator,[1] in speaking of Odysseus' visit to hades, and his meeting with the different shades of the departed, has certainly very exquisitely pourtrayed the interview with the shade of his mother.

"His heart is stirred up, convulsed with desire to embrace the dear shade of his departed mother; thrice he makes the attempt, but each time the shade eludes his arms like a dreamy vision. The disappointment kindles the more the flame of his desire."[2] Yet this description is tame and prosy compared with the Hebrew poem under consideration. Here we are not only told of the spiritual nature of the apparition, but we see it. We have before our eyes a phantom, and yet a living reality—we see an image—we stretch out our hand to grasp it, but it vanishes—we think it speaks, but it is a delusion. It can be perceived only by its effects, namely, in harrowing up the soul with terror and wonder—in making our hair stand on end—and we are ready to ask with Hamlet—

> "What may this mean
> That thou, dread corse, . . .
> Revisit'st thus the glimpses of the moon?"

---

[1] See Müller's Geschichte der Grichischen Literatur, i., p. 104.

[2] *αὐτὰρ ἔγωγ' εθελον φρεσὶ μερμηρίξας*
μητρὸς ἐμῆς ψυχὴν ἐλέειν κατατεθνηυίης
τρὶς μὲν εφωρμήθην, ελέειν τέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει
τρὶς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν, σκιῇ εἴκελον ἠκαὶ ὀνείρῳ
ἔπταt'. ἐμοί δ' ἄχος ὀξὺ γενεσκετο κηρόθι μαλλον.—Odyss. xi. 204-208.

Paranomasia and Parallelism in the New Testament.

Hebrew poetry, according to the view we have taken of it, is not restricted to the writings of the Old Testament, but extends also to those of the New.

That the New Testament Scriptures are not destitute of the true poetic fire is evident from the fact, that there is hardly a passage in the history of the life and sayings of our Lord which has not served to kindle the genius of the painter, sculptor, musician, or poet. To the Gospel history we owe the existence of some of the most sublime and exquisite productions in each of the imitative arts.[1] And inasmuch as the New Testament writings are pervaded by the Hebrew genius and diction, we find in them also traces of paranomasia and parallelism; especially in the discourses of our Lord and his Apostles, which are elevated by their earnestness and fervour above the level of prose. The following may serve as examples:—

1. As a paranomasia may be considered that memorable saying of our Lord to the Apostle Peter, Matt. xvi. 18—

"*And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*"

This passage forms the strongest pretext for papal imposition, and it is only to be regretted that it has not been fairly met by Protestant commentators. It may therefore not be out of place to state briefly our view of the same. After Peter's enlightened and open confession of the Messiahship of our Lord, Christ makes the name Πέτρος the occasion of declaring him to be the rock of the church. This is a Hebrew paranomasia, or play upon

[1] We esteem, therefore, Gilfillan's "Bards of the Bible," in this respect also, as an invaluable production, because it exhibits the sublimity of the New Testament even in its poetic and purely literary aspect.

words, viz., I have justly called thee Peter (John i. 42), signifying a rock, for thou art indeed a rock whereupon I shall build my church. Thus far, then, we agree with the Papists in thinking that the declaration refers to Peter personally, and not to his confession, as some Protestant commentators suppose; for it would then lose all force and significance. But the fatal error lies in the construction put upon the term rock.

What does that word mean in figurative Scripture language when applied to a person?

צור, rock; Greek, *πέτρος*, when applied to God, denotes—

a. The Creator and only protection of his people. Thus Moses says, הַצּוּר תָּמִים פָּעֳלוֹ, "the Rock! his work is perfect," Deut. xxxiii. 4; and the Psalmist, יְהוָה צוּרִי וְגוֹאֲלִי, "Jehovah is my Rock and Redeemer," Ps. xix. 15: and in this sense, Christ the Son of God is designated the Rock, the only foundation and corner-stone whereupon the church is built. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. i. 11).

b. It applies, also, in a subordinate sense, to parents; thus Abraham is styled the rock from whence the Jewish nation has been hewn out, as it were, Is. li. 1.

And in this latter sense, the Apostles—the fathers of the church—may also be said to be the foundation, or founders, of the church. "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone" (Eph. ii. 19, 20).

"For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. iii. 11). The same in Rev. xxi. 14, "And the wall of the city has twelve

foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb."

The appellation rock, therefore, applies to each of the Apostles, but it was addressed to Peter because it was suggested by his name and confession. Moreover, our Lord had evidently in view the attempt of Satan to betray him to apostacy, and with that sad event before his all-penetrating eye, he emphatically declares that it will be only a momentary collapse, from which he will soon rally, and triumph over the great adversary. As if our Lord had said, "It was my spirit that enabled thee to call me thy Lord, and that same spirit shall preserve thee as a rock to the church, in spite of him who is against thee."

2. Of New Testament parallelisms, the following may serve as examples—

> "They make broad their phylacteries,
> And enlarge the borders of their garments,
> And love the uppermost rooms at feasts,
> And the chief seats in the synagogues,
> And greetings in the markets,
> And to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi."

Then follow other six lines, containing three precepts and three reasons—

> "But be not ye called Rabbi,
> For one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.
> And call no man father upon earth;
> For one is your Father, which is in heaven.
> Neither be ye called masters;
> For one is your Master, even Christ."

Then, again, other six lines, containing three precepts and three antitheses—

> "But he that is greatest among you
> Shall be your servant;

And whosoever shall exalt himself
Shall be abased;
And he that shall humble himself
Shall be exalted."—Matt. xxv. 5-12.

"O, Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets,
And stonest them which are sent unto thee."—Matt. xxv. 37.

"But Peter, standing up with the eleven,
Lifted up his voice,
And said unto them,
Ye men of Judæa,
And all ye that dwell at Jerusalem,
Be this known unto you,
And hearken to my words."—Acts ii. 14.

Inspiration of Prophecy.

We have not exhausted the idea of poetry, when we say with Aristotle that it is an imitative art. It is certainly more than imitative, it is creative. Imitation is traceable to a faculty which is attainable by human effort, and may be perfected by exercise; but poetry, as well as all the fine arts, seem to have been sent down from heaven to a favourite few. Genius is a divine gift bestowed upon some, and which none can acquire whose spirits have not been baptized with the fire from above. "Atque sic de summis hominibus eruditissimique accepimus," says Cicero, "Ceterum rerum studia et doctrina et praeceptis et arte constare; poetam natura ipsa valere, et mentis viribis excitari et quasi Divino quodam spiritu inflari, quare suo jure noster ille Ennius sanctos apellat poetas quod quasi Deorum aliquo dono atque munere commendati nobis esse videantur,"[1] and hence, "semper apud omnes sancti sunt habiti atque dicti."[2]

The immediate divine inspiration of the poet, as held by the ancients, we cannot deny either to him who displays

[1] Oratio pro Archia Poeta, viii. [2] Ibid., xii.

upon the canvas in visible form the spirits of the saints at rest, or who gives the bronze semblance of breath, and draws living features from the marble block, nor to the artist who with his charming music melts the soul and fills it with religious awe, love, and adoration. "Rapt sages, seers, singers of every age and clime have doubtless experienced more or less consciously the impulse and guidance of a power not their own, a power which we need not hesitate to identify, as Milton did, with the fire that kindled Isaiah's bosom, and opened his burning lips."[1]

Now the question presenting itself in connexion with the subject before us is, namely, in what relation does the inspiration of *genius*, in general, stand to that inspiration which the prophets of the Bible were clothed with? The point of agreement between them seems to be this, that both inspiration of genius as well as that of prophecy are special gifts of God to the human race, for ennobling them, for elevating their souls from this earth, and training them for the appreciation of a higher spiritual existence and enjoyment. Their manner and character, however, are their points of divergence:—

First. The inspiration of art aims at generalities, whilst the prophetic inspiration has to do with a special message occasioned by historical facts. The one is a shooting meteor, the other a solar centre; yea, it is the centre around which all true art should cluster. The messengers of Jehovah should be the models of every true artist teaching him how to exercise the gifts vouchsafed unto him. But for sin which entered into the world, turning the gifts of God into abuse, and blighting the flowers of His grace,

[1] Dr. Candlish's Lecture on Maurice's Theological Essays.

all arts would be sanctified means of training souls for the kingdom of heaven.

Secondly. Whilst the artist has the power over his special gift to exercise it at pleasure, and may be said to have his inspiration inherent in himself—a constituent element of his soul—the prophet exercises his office, not by virtue of his own talent or genius, but is altogether dependent upon the Spirit of Jehovah to elevate him beyond himself, to speak of things which are above the reach of mortal vision, to testify of eternal truths which have never entered into the minds of men to conceive; and hence it is beyond his power to call forth the gift of prophecy by his own effort, by raising himself to a state of enthusiasm, as some poets, for pouring forth the strains of their muse, though he may put himself into a fit frame of mind, for the reception of the Spirit into his soul.

Thirdly. The difference, moreover, between the artist and the prophet is, that the former is best able to appreciate the creation of his own genius, whilst the latter, after delivering the oracle of Jehovah, is in many instances a stranger to its design. The prophets themselves "were searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow."[1] In short, in the one we have before us the effusion of the human genius, in the other, our thoughts are carried from the poet to the Spirit of God omniscient as its author. If genius then be called inspiration, we may apply to the prophets of the Bible what Vitringa says of Isaiah, "fuisse virum a spiritu S. non affectum tantum sed et inflammatum." We see them all, king, priest, and

[1] 1 Peter i. 11.

herdsman, in the full development of their mental physiognomy, but we see them as it were in a flame, illumined by the Spirit of God, whose active instruments they are. Inspiration of prophecy, accordingly, may be defined as *an extraordinary Divine influence, by which the messengers of Jehovah were instructed what and how they should write or speak while delivering his oracles.*

This view is implied in the Hebrew word נָבִיא (a prophet), signifying one who announces the words of another. The term has no root in Hebrew, but is explained by the later writers by the word מֵלִיץ, interpreter (Is. xliii. 27), and מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, messenger-Jehovah's (Hagg. i. 13); also אִישׁ הָרוּחַ, the man of the Spirit (Hos. ix. 7). It corresponds also with the expressions used by the Old Testament writers of the Spirit as "coming," "falling upon," "filling," "entering into," "bearing away" the prophets. Similar diction occurs in the New Testament: John xx. 22, *ἐνεφύσησε*, "He breathed upon them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Acts x. 44, *ἐπέπεσε*, "The Spirit fell upon them." Luke xxiv. 40, *ἐνδύσησθε*, "Ye shall be clothed with power from on high." 2 Pet. i. 21, *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι*, "borne along by the Holy Ghost."

The conception of an immediate Divine inspiration must be natural to the human mind, and result directly from its original constitution. It must be an idea implanted in man by his Maker, for the sake of preparing him for the reception of that revelation which He has been pleased to make, inasmuch as we find the belief in it prevail among all nations even from an early stage of civilization. There is no Pagan system of religion where this belief does not exhibit itself in one form or other—in the Vedas of the Hindoos, the books of Buddha, the

Zendavesta, the original Sibylline books, as well as the mythologies of Chaldea, Egypt, and Greece. Everything great and noble in the thoughts or actions of the ancient heroes, commanders, kings, and sages—all their great undertakings, their wars, and victories—were ascribed to the Deity working in them as instruments of its own purposes: "Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino umquan fuit."[1]

Minerva says to Telemachus:—

"Different things wilt thou perceive in thine own heart, but far otherwise will a God suggest."

Τηλέμαχ', ἄλλα μὲν αὐτὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῇσι νοήσεις
Ἄλλα δὲ καὶ δαίμων ὑποθήσεται.[2]

They went so far as to maintain that their soothsayers and minstrels did not themselves understand, and could not explain to others, what they spoke while under the influence of inspiration. Thus Plato, in his dialogue περὶ Ἰλιάδος (ἴων), puts the prevailing notions of the Greeks, with regard to inspiration, into the mouth of Socrates:—

Κοῦφον χρῆμα ποιητὴς ἐστὶ, καὶ πτηνὸν, καὶ ἱερὸν καὶ οὐ πρότερον οἷοστε ποιεῖν πρὶν ἂν ἔνθεός τε γένηται καὶ ἔκφρων, καὶ ὁ νοῦς μηκέτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνῇ· ἕως δ'ἄν τουτί ἔχῃ τὸ κτῆμα, ἀδύνατος πᾶν ποιεῖν ἐστὶν ανθρωπος, καὶ χρησμῳδεῖν . . . οὐ γὰρ τέχνῃ ταυτα λέγουσιν, ἀλλα θείᾳ δυνάμει . . . ὁ θεὸς ἐξαιρούμενος τοὐτων νοῦν, τούτοις χρῆται ὑπηρέταις, καὶ τοῖς χρησμῳδοῖς, καὶ τοῖς μάντεσι τοῖς θείοις· ἵνα ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀκούοντες εἰδῶμεν ὅτι οὐχ οὗτοι εἰσὶν οἱ ταῦτα λέγοντες, οὕτω πολλοῦ ἄξια οἷς νους μὴ πάρεστιν, αλλ' ὁ θεός ἐστιν ὁ λέγων· διὰ τούτων δὲ φθέγγεται πρὸς ἡμας.

"The poet cannot compose, nor the soothsayer prophesy, unless he is inspired by the Deity, and transported as it were beyond himself. He then loses sight of the rules of art, and is borne away by the Divine impulse. The Deity deprives him of his own

[1] Cicero de Natura Deorum, II. 66.
[2] Odyss. iii. 25.

consciousness and reflection, and employs him as an ambassador. *It is not he who speaks, but God who speaks through him.*"[1]

And Homer represents Telemachus checking his mother in her attempt to control the bard, saying:—

"Mother, why do you censure the lovely bard for solacing us, as his heart is overflowing? Not the bards, but Zeus is to blame, who puts it into the heart of every ingenious man and inspires them according to his own pleasure."

Μῆτερ ἐμὴ τί τ' ἄρα φθονέεις ἐρίηρον ἀοιδόν
Τέρπειν ὅππῃ οἱ νόος ὄρνυται; οὐ νυ τ' ἀοιδοὶ
Αἴτιοι, ἀλλά ποθι Ζεὺς αἴτιος ὃς τε διδωσιν
Ἀνδράσιν ἀλφηστῆσιν ὅπως ἐθέλῃσιν ἑκάστῳ.[2]

In all these we see a prototype of a true revelation which they must originally have been in possession of, and from which they receded, in proportion to the progress of corruption or influence of superstition, more or less gross in their character, which have been associated with them. They point us to the true inspiration of prophecy by which God makes His communication to men; for as surely as every counterfeit proves the existence of a sterling coin, even so do these notions of heathen tradition lead us to seek for a true inspiration.

We do not mean to pass an indiscriminate sweeping judgment upon all heathen oracles; we admit that there are among them also some glimpses of light. We must not restrict revelation and inspiration to the Jewish Scriptures. The Lord who, by His own free grace and mercy, revealed His will in divers manners to the Jewish and Christian church by their prophets and apostles, is not

---

[1] Quoted in Knapp's Lectures on Christian Theology.

[2] Odyss. i. 347-350. Compare Ovid:—
"Est deus in nobis agitante calescimus illo;
Impetus hic sacrae semina mentis habet."—*Fast.* vi. 5.

limited to these, He has undoubtedly sent some rays of light to other nations also; but in contrasting the heathen oracles as a class with those of Holy Writ, we may say, in the language of Bacon,[1] "There is no small difference between the *idols* of the human mind and the *ideas* of the Divine mind, *i. e.*, between idle dreams and impositions, and those oracles which bear the stamp and impression of the Spirit of Jehovah. All these have perished, but the Word of our God shall endure for ever."[2]

Inspiration of Scripture.

In the foregoing remarks, our attention was confined exclusively to the prophetical portions of Scripture. Regarding the immediate divine inspiration of these, there can exist but little diversity of opinion amongst divines. Those oracles and predictions which imply a foreknowledge of future events on the part of the writer, cannot but come directly from Him "who rules amidst the armies of heaven, and among the children of men." He who has the beginning, middle, and end of history in his own hand, claims it as his exclusive prerogative to foretell whatsoever shall come to pass.[3] But with regard to the inspiration of Scripture generally, *i. e.*, of the Old and New Testament writings as they have been handed down to us, conflicting opinions exist.

---

[1] Novum Organum, i. Aphor. 23.

[2] "The difference of the Pagan and Jewish belief in prophecy," says Davison, "is instructive. The Pagan first believed what his prophets and oracles told him and afterwards rejected, and the Jews slew their prophets and then built their sepulchres and confessed their mission."—*Discourses on Prophecy*, p. 51, 4th ed.

[3] Is. xli. 21-29; xliii. 9.

The arguments for the inspiration of the whole Scripture Canon, are drawn from the following facts :—

I. *Inspiration of the Old Testament.*

1. The Jews, at the time of Christ, though differing as regards the modes and degrees of inspiration, agreed in its leading conception. They believed not merely that the doctrines contained in the Old Testament were of divine origin, but that the Books themselves claim the Holy Spirit as their author. These views are expressed in the Talmud, and by Philo and Josephus,[1] and are moreover corroborated by

2. Christ and His Apostles, who did not seek to subvert this belief, as they treated all Jewish tradition; on the contrary, they confirmed these doctrines on all occasions.

As to our Lord, what was His whole life and ministry, but a confirmation of the prophets, an establishment of his claims to the Messiahship upon the foundation of the Old Testament predictions regarding His advent. We meet Him every where reasoning with the Jews from their own Scriptures, that He is the Christ of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets, and the Psalmist, did write by the Holy Ghost.[2]

---

[1] Contra Apionem, I. 7.

[2] Dr. Henderson (on Divine Inspiration, Lecture vi.) says, "that to rest our argument upon the *authority of the Son of God* is to rest upon a basis undisturbed by the attacks of scepticism and unbelief; for none can consistently call in question His authority who does not reject the entire mass of historical and moral evidence by which His mission, and the religion which He founded, are immoveably supported." We see no reason why this should have put Mr. Carson out of temper, who frets and scolds (in his "Refutation of Dr. H."). The calm and dignified style of Dr. H.'s Lectures, and the writings of the late Dr. Pye Smith, who are the subjects of Mr. Carson's indignation, should have taught him a better lesson in what animus such controversies ought to be carried on.

3. The Apostle Paul, in exhorting Timothy to hold fast the doctrine which was taught by the Apostles, assigns the following reasons: "Because their doctrine is in accordance with the Sacred Scriptures (*ἱερά γράμματα*), which thou from childhood hast been trained to believe, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith, which is in Christ Jesus (*i. e.*, the Old Testament leads to Christ, and is preparatory to the Gospel); and because all Scripture (*Πάσα γραφὴ*), is given by inspiration of God (*θεόπνευστος*, is divinely inspired), and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."[1]

This passage may be styled, as Henderson remarks,[2] the principal *dictum classicum*, to which, more than to any other, the supporters of the doctrine of inspiration have appealed. A diversity of opinion, however, exists with regard to the interpretation of the expression *πᾶσα γραφὴ*. Some comprehending, under the term *γραφὴ*, the whole of that ancient volume, and others restricting it to those parts only of which they think *θεόπνευστος* may be predicated. A second class regard it as designating not only the inspired Codex of the Jews, but also such of the Apostolic writings as had then appeared; while a third class confine it exclusively to the latter.

By looking impartially into the drift of the Apostles' reasoning, it must appear evident to those who have no theory at stake, that the passage in question refers to "*all Scripture*," both of the Old and of the New Testament.[3]

---

[1] 2 Timothy iii. 14-17.

[2] P. 219 *ut sup.*

[3] Others render, "Everything divinely inspired [is] also profitable," as the late Dr. Pye Smith, who was ably answered by Dr. Tregelles, viz., *γραφὴ* is used definitely *Holy Scripture*, like *ἱερα γράμματα* of the preceding verse, which refers to the Old Testament only, whilst *πᾶσα γραφὴ* is more general *all Scripture*, as in 2 Pet. i. 20, *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς*. The rendering "all Scripture that is [divinely

4. The Apostle Peter, in reasoning against the Jews and the Judaizing heretics, that Jesus was the true Messiah, appeals to those predictions of the Old Testament prophets which had been fulfilled in Him :—

2 Peter i. 19, 20. "We find the oracles of the prophets (respecting Christ), much more convincing now (since they have been fulfilled), and ye will do well to attend to them. Formerly, before their fulfilment, they were obscure, like a lantern shining feebly in a dark path, until the appearance of Christ upon the earth, from which event a clearer light now proceeds, and we can better understand the prophecies."

Nor could the prophets themselves give a clear explanation (επιλύσις), of their own oracles, because they had only indistinct conceptions of the subjects on which they spoke, and knew only so much as was communicated to them from time to time, by divine revelation.

Ver. 21. "For the prophecy came not in old time, by the will of man, BUT HOLY MEN OF GOD SPAKE AS THEY WERE MOVED BY THE HOLY GHOST.[1]"

II. *The Inspiration of the New Testament.*

The inspiration of the New Testament writers to qualify them for their sacred office, rests upon the promise of their Divine Master: "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will

---

divinely inspired is also useful" implies that there is some Scripture which is not divinely inspired; thus the idea excludes the appropriated sense of the word. Who, moreover, could need to be told that all Divine Scripture is useful? See Remarks on the Prophetic Vision of Daniel, p. 285, *seq.*

[1] See Knapp's Lectures, *ut sup.*

send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."[1]

"But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me.

"And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."[2]

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He will show you things to come."[3]

These and similar promises of our Saviour, of an extraordinary Divine influence to attend them constantly, are the arguments upon which we rely in proving the inspiration of the New Testament Scriptures; when for instance, He said to them, when they spoke under this Divine impulse, *it would not be they who spoke, but the Holy Spirit*; or when He forbade them also to meditate what they should say before judicial tribunals, since they should then be taught by the Divine Spirit, not only *what*, but *how* they should speak. Now, if the Apostles were assisted in this manner in their discourses, which were merely oral, and of course, of a very temporary and limited advantage, how much more should they be assisted in their written instructions, which were destined to exert a more lasting and extended influence!

This, then, is the basis of our belief in the Divine inspiration of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, the whole

---

[1] John xiv. 25, 26. [2] John xv. 26, 27.
[3] John xvi. 12, 13.

amount of light which the Bible sheds upon the subject; for according to its high origin and design, it speaks in the most simple language, as it treats upon matters which have a practical bearing, without gratifying speculative tendencies. All speculations, accordingly, in which divines have engaged, as to its *mode* and *degrees*, lie more properly within the province of metaphysics, and cannot be decided by Scripture authority.

But considering how little we know even of the nature of animal life; for instance, of that power which physiologists call *vital contractility*, or of the *elective power* by which each organ and tissue absorbs from the food the particles suitable for its own assimilation and nourishment, which are principles altogether independent of mechanical or chemical agencies,[1]—phenomena which physiologists cannot account for, but must rest satisfied with scientific terms, which simply state the facts under general expressions, while, at the same time, they screen their ignorance of the *modus operandi*. Seeing, then, the mysteries in which the study of our material frame is enveloped, how much more mysterious is the study of that part of our being, which can neither be discerned by the microscope, nor tested by chemical reagents—the immortal spirit, which Jehovah breathed into our nostrils when we became living souls! Reasoning from analogy, we must regard the difficulties as insurmountable, inasmuch as all metaphysics which is not founded upon sound principles of physiology, is baseless, however plausible it may appear. With such difficulties attending our inquiry, then let us duly "measure the length of our line, and not try to fathom with it

[1] Carpenter's Human Physiology, p. 345, and Williams's Principles of Medicine, p. 100.

all the depths of the ocean,"—let us rather confess our ignorance, than assign reasons for everything we do not understand, and account for things which are above our comprehension, because beyond the circle of our experience.

Now, in the conceptions of Prophecy and Inspiration, there are two objects concerned,—the *Divine Spirit* who operates, and the *human mind*, which is acted upon, both of which lie beyond our research and comprehension, hence their union, their co-operation to produce prophetic annunciations, etc., is transcendently sublime and mysterious.

As the idea of *prophecy* implies, that God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass;[1] because He acts according to a fixed plan, and presents before our view those mighty pillars, the junction of which is beyond our ken, namely, God's eternal purposes and decrees according to which He governs the world, on the one hand, and man's free agency on the other, even so does the idea of inspiration bring before us written documents of which the Holy Spirit is the true author, and yet they are written by men who have put their seal to them as their own compositions. As to these, and similar subjects which are revealed to us in the Divine word, we must bow before their sublimity, but we shall in vain seek to unravel their mysterious workings.

[1] Arminians are in the habit of meeting Calvinists upon the field of certain passages of Scripture, where the doctrines of election and foreordination are taught, and, by explaining those passages after their own fashion, they seem to think that they have settled the dispute to their own advantage. Thus Mr. Morison (in his Lectures on the 9th Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Kilmarnock, 1849) thinks that he has stormed the city of refuge of Calvinists. But supposing even that he had succeeded in taking this stronghold from them (which he certainly did not in our estimation, inasmuch as there is still, even according to his own exposition, a principle of election implied in that chapter), the greatest argument against his dogma still remains, namely, HOW CAN GOD PROPHECY, PREDICT, IF THE FUTURE DEPENDS UPON EMERGENCIES?

With these preliminary remarks, we enter upon the consideration of some of the theories regarding the

Mode of Inspiration.

1. The theory of a *mechanical* or *organic inspiration*, according to which the sacred writers were merely passive instruments or amanuenses of the Holy Spirit, in the composition of their books, is one of the oldest in the Church, which numbers at present but few advocates.

This view has been maintained by Philo and by the ancient Church fathers, who compared the inspired writers to flutes upon which the Spirit of God played. Hengstenberg[1] advanced the same theory, thinking that, during the exercise of their office, the sacred writers were deprived of all intelligent consciousness, and each word was instilled into their minds, or rather put into their mouths (the operation of the mind being totally suspended for the time being); and we think it is in the main adopted by Gaussen.[2]

If such a view could possibly be maintained consistently with facts, it would leave nothing to be explained, everything would be patent and congruous; but, unfortunately, such an idea is totally repugnant to the nature of these prophecies and irreconcilable with the following facts.

a). When God does not employ angels, or other beings higher in the scale of intelligence, as His messengers, but chooses men as His medium for communicating His will to the world, why should He unmake the man?—why deprive

[1] "We may then apply to the true prophets, also, what Plato has enlarged upon in his Ion and Phaedrus, viz., that prophesying is necessarily accompanied by the suppression of human agency, intelligence, and consciousness."—*Christology*, vol. i., p. 220 (Keith's translation).

[2] Theopneustia.

them of consciousness, of the free use of their intellectual faculties, by means of which alone they can work upon their fellow-mortals?

b). It is contrary to the nature of these writings themselves, for it is obvious that even the prophets when wrapt in their visions were conscious of the objects that passed before their view; they reasoned and proposed questions concerning them, and though they could not penetrate the obscurity which, from various causes, must have enveloped many parts of the scenery, they, nevertheless, had intelligent conceptions of the general bearing and design of the whole.[1] And when we come to the historical writings of the Old Testament, and to those of the evangelists and apostles of the New, there we find that the writers were perfectly conversant with the facts which they record, as witnesses testifying of the things which they have seen and heard; and in such capacity it is absolutely necessary that they should be conscious of what they are writing or saying.[2]

c). This theory is, moreover, irreconcilable with the fact of the individuality of both conception and style discernible in each of the writers. This could not be the case if they were merely passive flutes or amanuenses, for the dictater does not accommodate himself to the style of the amanuensis.

2. From this contracted view of the case, others have been driven to an opposite extreme, namely, to assume a vague general notion of inspiration. They maintain that the writers of the Bible had a general commission to write, the form and style being left to themselves. It is

[1] Henderson, p. 116, *ut sup.*

[2] The Apostles, in their Epistles, carry on perfect logical argumentations, propose objections and refute them, and so on.

maintained, according to this view of the subject, that in matters of non-essential importance the authors of the Bible were liable to err. This extreme view has been advocated very strongly by Dr. Tholuck, prompted, we presume, by the heat of controversy, rather than by his deliberate conviction.[1]

Upon this assumption, then, we could not be said to possess "a sure word of prophecy," unalloyed with errors and human imperfections; all our appeals to the law and to the testimony in matters of faith must give way to scepticism; for who will draw the line of demarcation between the thoughts of God and the thoughts of men, between pure truths and statements, coloured by the hue of human feelings, passions, and misconceptions? Whatever does not suit the carnal mind will be considered as a mere figure of speech, everything contrary to the spirit of unbelief will be looked upon as oriental hyperbole—an exaggeration! It is, moreover, contrary to the explicit declaration of Scripture, to the testimony of Christ and his apostles, as noticed above. A modification of this theory is, that two different impulses have acted at the same time upon the authors while composing the Scriptures; the natural impulses of their individuality and the miraculous impulses of inspiration, and from this conflict resulted the concurrence, the balanced action, of these two forces. As this also seems to imply that the human element in the

[1] This was our first impression on reading his Articles in the "Deutsche Zeitschrift." The breach caused in the Theological Academy of Geneva by the secession of Professor Scherer induced him to show that verbal inspiration is not essential to the dogmas of the Lutheran Church—that many who would willingly have given their lives for the doctrines of the Bible were still no adherents to that doctrine: in which pleading, however, he went further than he anticipated. The articles in question are translated, with valuable annotations, in the Journal of Sacred Literature for July, 1854.

composition is liable to error, it is exposed to the same objections.

3. Between these extremes, which cannot stand the test, there is a medium which we may safely follow, viz., we consider on the one hand the Holy Spirit as the primary author of the Sacred Scriptures, and on the other hand the writers as the active instruments in the execution of them, on which account they also may be regarded as the authors of these productions. They are the works of God and the works of men conjointly. The souls of men were co-operating in the composition, in being blended with the Spirit of God. The effect produced upon the writer by the spirit of inspiration is analogous to the *vital force* of organic matter which forms it and furthers its development. There is thus a dynamical relation, an interpenetration between them, which had the effect of both preserving them from error and of raising them above their natural endowments (not by a suspension or cessation of their mental faculties, but) by invigorating and hallowing them. Hence it is that we have before us in each of these books the impression of the genius of the writer—the whole man with all his faculties, affections, memory, and imagination heightened, intensified by the zeal of Jehovah and illumined by His Spirit, emblazoned as an unmistakable object of His creation.

In these Books, then, which form the collection of the Bible Canon, we behold a sublime edifice reared upon the foundation of history,—called forth by the circumstances of the times, and the necessities of the age, by men of different educational and mental peculiarities; each added a stone or a pillar to the erection of that grand temple, which should speak to future generations. Here, as in the natural world, there is a unity in diversity; various are the

occasions which gave rise to each Book or oracle, various are the men whom the Lord used as his instruments, various the gifts of these writers, but they are all one in their object, namely, to teach the world the knowledge of Jehovah, and His worship.

This view is, in the main, followed by Delitzsch,[1] Eadie,[2] and others, and is the only likely and tenable theory. In short, we believe in plenary verbal inspiration of the Bible, but in a *rational inspiration*, instead of a *mechanical infusion.*

This we say is the only tenable position, inasmuch as even those orthodox divines, who object to verbal inspiration in theory, are still tacitly assuming it in their apologetics, as is seen in the case of—

a). Luther, who, though maintaining that the matter, and not the words of Scripture were inspired, yet in his controversy respecting the Lord's Supper, he was obliged to advocate the inspiration of the words of the institution;[3] and—

b). Professor Stuart, although an opposer to verbal inspiration, yet, when his opponent (Mr. Norton), would substitute (in John v. 46,) *spoke* for *wrote*, and *words* for *writings*, he says, "This expedient to which Mr. Norton resorts, shows the desperate nature of the cause which he is labouring to defend. On this ground, no declaration of Scripture, anywhere, in any passage, on any subject, is

[1] Biblisch Prophetische Theologie, p. 70. "Sie sind in ihrer art Einziges dass inerhalb der Sphäre des menschlichen nicht seines Gleichen hat. Sie sind die wahren Urheber ihrer Bücher aber die secundären, active Werkzeuge Gottes συνεργοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. Gott hat ihre Denhungskraft, ihre Einsicht und ihr Gedächtniss zu dem bestimten Act und Zwecke gesteigert, ihren Willen bewogen, ihre freiwillige Entschlüssung dirigirt und geleitet."

[2] Lecture, "Inspiration in Conflict with recent forms of Philosophy and Scepticism." Edinburgh.

[3] Henderson, p. 44, *ut sup.*

exempt from arbitrary alterations, at the will and pleasure of every reader. Of course the Scripture is not the rule of our faith, but our faith is the rule of Scripture."

This is sound and excellent reasoning, only on the assumption that *every word*, as well as *idea*, has the impress of the Holy Spirit.

c). Dr. Pye Smith, also, though opposed to verbal inspiration in his discussion of theories, when arguing against Socinians, upheld the force of words as fully, as if his theoretic opinions had been just the contrary.

Dr. Tregelles accordingly, in referring to this striking fact,[1] says, "When asked what theory I maintained, I would answer 'none!' for I consider inspiration to be a fact, and not a theory,—a fact which makes Holy Scripture to be what it is—the Word of God (so termed by our Lord himself, Mark vii. 13), and not the word of man."[2]

Degrees of Inspiration.

To explain the difficulties connected with the discussion on inspiration,—the *modus operandi* of which must always remain a mystery to us, from its being so much beyond the reach of our experience, or circle of our vision, and being left unexplained by the sacred writers themselves—divines have adopted the theory of different degrees of

[1] Remark on Daniel, p. 288.

[2] To the same effect, Dr. Eadie:—"Are we not then warranted to affirm that a second and essential element involved in the true idea of inspiration is, that Divine influence so guides the mind and words of the prophet, that the oracle comes forth from him, in form, veracity, and amount, unchanged from the original revelation which God had disclosed? We contend for plenary and verbal inspiration as indispensable to our faith in the books of Scripture. Inspiration must be plenary, for the Divine influence will not cease to exert itself on the chosen medium of communication till the whole work aimed at be achieved."

What are our grammars, lexicons, concordances, and commentaries, our treatises on archæology and hermeneutics, but our instruments for ascertaining the sense of Scripture by its words?—*ut sup.*

inspiration, which degrees vary with the character of the writer, and the nature of the subject. In this view of the case, though it is admitted that all Scripture was given by Divine inspiration, yet that inspiration extends in different degrees to the different portions of Scripture. But in the application of this theory different views exist:—

1. Some are content with the general statement, that there are different degrees, and do not think proper to determine the degree of any given passage. They go no further than to say, that in writing on subjects of the first importance, in communicating facts which could have been learned only from revelation, and in cases where there was peculiar liability to mistake, the sacred writers enjoyed the highest degree of Divine influence,—the inspiration of words (*Inspiratio verbalis*); but that, in treating of subjects of inferior interest—for example, in recording historical facts,—they enjoyed no higher assistance than was necessary to secure them against error—to refresh their recollections with the knowledge which they had before acquired, or, perhaps, to give the first impulse to speak or write. Thus Michaelis, Döderlein and others.

2. The great body of modern theologians believe in *three* degrees of inspiration:—

a). The first and highest degree of inspiration, is the revelation of things before unknown to the sacred writers (*Inspiratio anticedens*, or revelation), and hold that revelation is always attended by inspiration, but that inspiration is not in every case preceded by revelation. Everything in the Bible is inspired, but everything there is not revealed, for much of its contents were known to the writers from their own reflection.

b). The second degree of inspiration is the security against error, which God afforded them in the exhibition of

doctrines or facts, with which they were already acquainted, the care which he took in the selection, truth, and intelligibleness of the subject introduced, and the words for expressing them (*Inspiratio concomitans*).

c). The third degree of inspiration is the Divine authority, stamped upon the writings originally composed without inspiration, by the approbation of inspired men, and is called *Inspiratio consequens*. This degree is referred to the historical Books of the Old Testament, which were approved by Christ and his Apostles, and the Gospels of Mark and Luke, which were approved of by Peter and Paul, and afterwards by John.[1]

This theory is developed by Doddridge, and still more fully by Töllner, who endeavours to show that the authority of the Holy Scriptures, as the source of our knowledge in matters of faith, is perfectly secured even in cases where only the lowest degree of inspiration is admitted.[2] It has also been adopted, with some modifications, by the late Dr. Dick,[3] Wilson, and others.

d). Dr. Henderson, taking up this view, develops it still further, and finds *five* degrees of inspiration :—

1st. *Divine excitement*, when the inspired men proceeded to commit to writing those matters which it was the will of God should be permanently preserved.

2nd. *Invigoration*, by which they were elevated above the imperfections which would have incapacitated them from receiving those communications of a higher order, with which they were favoured, and by which, also, they were enabled perfectly to recollect, and infallibly to reason respecting truths and facts with which they were previously

[1] Knapp's Lectures on Christian Theology, Ward's edition, p. 62 *seq.*
[2] Die Göttliche Eingebung der heiligen Schrift. Leipzig, 1782.
[3] An Essay on the Inspiration of the Holy Scripture. Glasgow, 1840.

acquainted, but which owing to the lapse of time, or the decay of mental vigour, they were unfit, without such supernatural aid, accurately and fully to make known to the world.

3rd. *Divine superintendence*, in virtue of which Divine guardianship they were preserved from all error of mistake, and commit to writing, for the benefit of posterity, nothing but what was deemed proper by Infinite Wisdom.

4th. *Guidance* was another of the modes in which Divine inspiration operated upon the penmen of Scripture. This was bestowed upon them according to the promise of our Saviour to his Apostles, that the Paraclete should "lead them into all truth." By the influence thus exerted, the Apostles were to be directed into the whole truth—the entire system of Christian doctrine, comprehending the numerous topics on which they needed instruction, but which, during our Lord's public ministry, their prejudices, and slowness of comprehension had prevented Him from bringing before them (John xvi. 12).

5th. The last and highest species of inspiration is *direct revelation*. To this head are to be referred all those doctrines which had previously been hid in the Divine mind, all knowledge of past events, respecting which no record or tradition existed; all acquaintance with circumstances present, in point of existence, but of which the writers could not but be totally ignorant, and all communications respecting future contingent events, the foreknowledge of which is the sole prerogative of Deity. Whatever is found in Scripture in the form of a Divine purpose, promise, or threatening, comes under this class. *Where verbal inspiration was necessary, it was vouchsafed to them.*[1]

[1] *Vide* p. 260-274, *ut sup.*

Now, our position, with regard to this theory, is this, *viz.*, as to the general principle of different degrees of inspiration, we can find nothing objectionable either in Scripture or in reason.[1] On the contrary, it is very natural to suppose that certain portions involved a higher activity of the Spirit than others. It only manifests an extreme degree of nervous irritability, like that of Carson, to quarrel with the theory in its outline.[2] But we cannot follow it into its details—into the regular graduation of Scripture; for in trying to do so, we feel as if the ground is vanishing under our feet. We have no data, no solid basis upon which we could safely construct any sort of *Inspirometer*, capable of being reduced to practice.

For instance, under what degree would we put the Gospel narratives? At first sight it would appear—according to Dr. Henderson's classification—that *Divine excitement* was their proper place; but in looking more narrowly into these sacred documents we shall find that, although the writers appear before us in the capacity of witnesses, who record things which they have seen and heard—events which passed before their own notice—yet, considering the amount of evidence for the truth of Christianity which rests upon their testimony, not only as regards the facts, but also in respect of the manner of their narratives, we must assign to them even a higher degree

---

[1] That Moses was favoured with a higher degree of inspiration than the rest of the prophets is evident from Num. xii. 6, 7, "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently and not in dark speech, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold." Elisha also asked from Elijah, "Let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me," 2 Kings ii. 9.

[2] Gaussen, who is generally very judicious in his remarks, should not have mixed up this question with *verbal inspiration*.

of inspiration (if such existed) than is requisite for oracular declarations of future events.

Let us think for a moment of these fishermen and tentmakers of Judea, how they record the sufferings and death of their beloved master, to whom they have devoted their lives, as the true Messiah promised to their fathers. Let us suppose them under the influence of *Divine excitement* (or enthusiasm) to write the life of Christ. What outbursts of warm feelings and sympathies with the sufferer, and indignation against his bloody persecutors! It would only be natural to the human element in the composition to fill it with cries and lamentation; but we should then consider them as partial witnesses, prompted by their natural affections and partiality for their master. Now when we contemplate the calm and majestic dignity of these illiterate men—their pathetic simplicity—we must acknowledge that they are no enthusiasts, but impartial witnesses; and we must own at the same time that it is only by an immediate *Divine inspiration*, teaching them *what* and *how* they should write, that they could have been divested of self. Only by the highest degree of inspiration were they enabled to write in such a style which would melt the hearts of future generations, who, whilst listening to their history of the sufferings and death of the Saviour, exclaim with the centurion, "Truly, this is the Son of God!"

Yet, although we are unable to reduce this theory to any practical application, we do not feel disposed to call it fanciful, or to treat it as a germ of heterodoxy. Let us not despise a principle so reasonable, but let us rather turn it to some good account. What do we know? We are just in the infancy of our scientific researches. Lord Rosse's next telescope may disperse the nebulæ which

conceal such mysteries from our imperfect vision. Another Swedenborg may bring some sort of chloroform, laughing-gas, or such like stuff from the spiritual world, and construct an inspirometer for every verse of Scripture exceeding in exactness that of Fahrenheit. Until then, and so long as we cannot collect, refract, the essence of the human mind, and work with it as we do with light, heat, and electricity, and so long as we "cannot find out the Spirit of God unto perfection," we rest satisfied with the general statement that "all Scripture was given by Divine inspiration"—each part in such a degree as Infinite Wisdom thought the nature of the case and the subject required. Accordingly, we adopt Dr. Henderson's definition of inspiration as "*An extraordinary and supernatural influence exerted by the Holy Spirit on the minds of the sacred writers, in such modes and degrees as to lead to, and secure in documentary forms, the deposition of such historical, didactic, devotional, and prophetic truth, as Infinite Wisdom deemed requisite for the immediate and future benefit of mankind.*"[1]

[1] P. 254, *ut sup.*

Double Sense of Prophecy.

In our exposition of the Old Testament quotations in the New,[1] we have briefly indicated our view with regard to the much-litigated method of interpretation called "*double sense.*" We have there stated in what sense, we conceive, the inspired writers of the New Testament quote passages from the Old, in which, apparently, no Messianic prediction or allusion was ever intended by the Hebrew writers. It remains for us to mention here the principal arguments urged by divines on both sides of the question, and to make good our position. The question, "Has the Bible more senses than one?" arose from the manner in which the writers of the New Testament quote the language of the Old.

Expositors read a passage in the Old Testament which, according to the rule of language and in its natural connexion, must have such and such a meaning; but then, turning to an inspired writer of the New Testament, they found that he quotes the same passage in a different sense from what they understood it. Thus, unable to give up their own interpretation, but at the same time unwilling to

[1] *Vide infra*, p. 123, *seq.*

reject the interpretation of that infallible authority, they have resorted to the expedient of putting both senses into that passage, *i. e.*, they maintain that the Hebrew writer, or, rather, the Holy Spirit, intended to convey both senses by the same passage. This is, in short, the history of its origin.

And *double sense* being once propounded as a scientific nomenclature, and admitted as a legitimate principle into sacred hermeneutics, it is easy to perceive, why it should have taken such firm hold in the field of exegesis; it not only possesses many charms for the mystic, but is too valuable a boon even for the better class of commentators to be set aside so easily.

"How convenient such a method of interpretation is," says Professor Stuart, "too many critics have long since discovered: whatever one cannot well apply to David the type, may of course be referred to Christ the antitype. Where it would cost much study and trouble, and demand an extensive and accurate knowledge of the Hebrew language and idiom in order to determine the precise nature of an expression in the Old Testament, the interpreter who is hastening his work, or shrinks from protracted labour and minute investigation, or is wanting in that knowledge of the Hebrew which will enable him to pursue an investigation to its ultimate sources, makes use of the very simple expedient of applying one part of a passage to one individual in a literal sense, and another part to Christ in a higher and spiritual sense."[1]

Hence it so happens that in process of time all the learning and the flowers of rhetoric have been lavished to bolster it up, to varnish and beautify it, and to over-

[1] The Biblical Repository for January, 1831, p. 52, *seq.*

come the objectionable element which it bears upon its very surface. Lowth covers double sense with the panoply of his masterly eloquence, presenting it in the form of a mystical allegory.

Referring to the second Psalm, he says, "The subject of this poem is the establishment of David upon the throne agreeably to the Almighty decree, notwithstanding the fruitless opposition of his enemies. The character which David sustains in this poem is twofold—literal and allegorical. If, on the first reading of the Psalm, we consider the character of David in the literal sense, the composition appears sufficiently perspicuous, and abundantly illustrated by facts from the sacred history. Through the whole, indeed, there is an unusual fervour of language—a brilliancy of metaphor—and sometimes the diction is uncommonly elevated, as if to intimate that something of a more sublime and important nature lay concealed within, and as if the poet had some intention of admitting us to the secret recess of his subject. If, in consequence of this indication, we turn our minds to contemplate the internal sense, and apply the same passages to the allegorical David, a nobler series of events is presented to us, and a meaning not only more sublime, but even more perspicuous, rises to the view. Should anything at first appear bolder and more elevated than the obvious sense would bear, it will now at once appear clear, expressive, and admirably adapted to the dignity of the principal subject.

"We may then perceive the vast disparity of the two images, and yet the continual harmony and agreement that subsists between them; the amazing resemblance, as between near relations, in every feature and lineament, and the accurate analogy which is preserved, so that either

may pass for the original whence the other was copied. New light is reflected upon the diction, and a degree of dignity and importance is added to the sentiments, whilst they gradually rise from humble to more elevated subjects —from human to divine—till at length the great subject of the poem is placed in the most conspicuous light, and the composition attains the highest point of sublimity."[1]

Dr. Davidson, though strongly opposed to mystical interpretations, as well as to the misapplication of the theory of double sense, is still in favour of the principle; maintaining that many passages of Scripture cannot be explained on any other hypothesis. In adverting to the "*double fulfilment of prophecy*," he remarks: "Perhaps the phrase is objectionable. There cannot with propriety be double fulfilment, because the entire application and scope is not realized till both events take place. The former occurrence is merely an incipient and anticipative development of the latter. It connects the visible and temporal in the Jewish economy with the spiritual and distant future; pointing the waiting desires of the pious Hebrew along the line of prophecy to a glorious consummation."[2] "When symbolical persons or transactions are blended in the description with their spiritual counterpart, it is observable that the features which more appropriately belong to the one are sometimes made prominent, and, again, those peculiarly applicable to the other. Occasionally, the language swells out in so exalted a strain, that theocratic objects recede, leaving their spiritual associates to fill the eye and the heart of the seer; at other times, the former seem to have occupied their natural position in the foreground."[3]

[1] Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews: Lecture xi.
[2] Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 52. [3] Ibid., p. 55.

In the mean time, it cannot be denied that, the theory in question seems to lose ground among enlightened critics. Considerations like those of Dr. Alexander seem to find an echo among the learned: "A plurality of senses is so unlike what we should expect in a revelation of the Divine will; the admission of it is so apt to be abused, and, indeed, has so often been abused to the purpose of fanaticism and error; the principle of it is so arbitrary, and so entirely unauthorized by any of the New Testament expositions of prophecy; and the application of it is so uncertain and fluctuating, even in the hands of its most able advocates, that unless it can be shown to be absolutely indispensable for the consistent interpretation of prophecy, no sober inquirer after truth will consider himself justified in adopting it. It, in fact, exposes the prophetical Scriptures to be turned into a mere arena for the display of fanciful ingenuity, and endangers the entire evidences of prophecy, viewed as a prediction of future events."[1] And Professor Lee:—"Whatever this may be, it is not a just interpretation of the Scriptures, but is an adaptation of its declarations to circumstances which do not appear ever to have entered the minds of the sacred writers, and to build up the Christian church upon matters which may just as conveniently be extracted from Livy, Tacitus, and Thucydides, and eventually to bring into *disrepute* that which was intended to elevate to an unusual *height of glory* and admiration."[2] "If there be an occult sense to the words of Scripture," says Professor Stuart, "not conveyed by the language itself, to be attained in some way independent of the laws of language,

[1] The Connexion and Harmony of the Old and New Testament, p. 224.
[2] On Prophecy, p. 280.

then it would follow that he who reads the Scriptures, and applies to them the laws of interpretation common to all other books, can have no security that he has arrived at the principal and most important meaning which they were designed to convey. If there be an occult meaning couched under the words of Scripture, a second inspiration is needed in order to understand a second, or *occult revelation*, *i. e.*, a second sense of words."[1]

There is, indeed, something strange about the theory of double sense. To maintain that some portions of the Old Testament have more senses than one appears very much like a contradiction in terms. How could such portions form part of a *revelation* when, after we have ascertained their meaning, we are still left as ignorant as ever of their import, since under these words another, deeper meaning still lies hidden? Besides, how, and upon what principle, can we ever be sure that we have arrived at the true secondary meaning, or that we have perfectly exhausted the burden of these passages, and that our work as commentators is accomplished? There may be a third, fourth, fifth, or—as the Rabbis maintain—seventy meanings lurking still deeper under these very words.

In fact, there is no end to the objections which may be urged, *à priori*, against this method of interpretation. But in reasoning concerning principles of sacred herme-

---

[1] Biblical Repository, *ut sup*, p. 63 *seq*. To the authorities adduced may be added such names as Professor Eadie, whose views may be gathered from his Commentary on the Ephesians, and Dr. Henderson, who says: "There is really no prophecy which may not be restricted to one sense—such a sense as fully meets all the exigencies of the connexion in which it occurs."—*Introductory Dissertation to his Translation of Isaiah*, p. 29. See also an able article on the subject by Dr. Palfrey, in his Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities, vol. ii. p. 343, *seq*.

neutics, we must not allow ourselves to be carried away either by good things which may be said against a principle under dispute, nor to be biassed by the unattractive nature of the same. It is true that the Bible speaks to man in his own language, and hence it must be read and interpreted according to the common rules of language; but we should bear in mind that we have before us not only *a book*, but *the Book of God*, which must, in many respects, be interpreted according to rules peculiar to itself. The Old Testament, in particular—with its theocratic institutes, which were all finger-posts pointing to Christ—has no analogy among profane literature, ancient or modern; and hence no inference can, *à priori*, be drawn from the common use of language against the double reference of some of the Old Testament prophecies.

We are perfectly convinced that those learned critics, who, like Dr. Davidson, defend *double sense*, are quite as indignant against its abuse as ourselves. In listening to some discourses in which the Gospel is extracted from the sayings of Eliphaz the Temanite,—from the doings of Ahasuerus, or from other passages of a similar import, they heartily wish double sense out of existence, with all the species of whining and fanaticism which sprung from it. "What!" we hear them exclaim, "is there no wide range enough in the holy Gospel of our blessed Lord, that men must fabricate another Gospel of their own?"

Yet, it is not from the abuse of principles that we must judge them, but from their legitimate application. Therefore, notwithstanding all plausible objections raised against it, we would have no hesitation in giving our assent to double sense, if we saw no other method of reconciling the quotations of the Old Testament in the New. We should not be deterred from adopting this method of interpreta-

tion, by all that can be mustered against it, if we could not explain the words of Christ and His Apostles in any other way. A better foundation we could not have than the authority of the infallible teachers.

Now, turning from vague disputes to sound argumentation, we find that the theory of double sense rests solely upon the construction put upon the formula in which the New Testament writers introduce their quotation from the Old, as, *e. g.*, Matt. i. 22: Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γεγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου. "All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet." And other abbreviated form, ἵνα πληρωθῇ, and so on.

Those who contend for double sense understand ἵνα πληρωθῇ as indicating the relation of the prediction thus quoted to the subject in hand, as *cause and effect*, or *purpose*, *i. e.*, it implies—according to them—a purpose and design of God; an overruling Providence by which He brings events to pass so as to fulfil a particular design; whilst they who object to the theory render ἵνα πληρωθῇ, *so that it was fulfilled*; making ἵνα equivalent to ὥστε.

In support of the latter view, the Hebrew word לְמַעַן (*in order that*) is appealed to, which sometimes denotes an accidental consequence or a sequent event of which the preceding was only the *occasion*, not the intended effect. As Jer. vii. 19, "Do they provoke me to anger? saith the Lord. Do they not provoke themselves, לְמַעַן, TO the confusion of their own faces." Hosea viii. 4, "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not; of their silver and their gold have they made them idols, לְמַעַן, THAT they may be cut off." And Amos ii. 7.

Again, as to the term πληρόω, which primarily signifies

to fill, fulfil, complete, ratify; it is sometimes used to denote such a resemblance of circumstances that the words of a former writer may be literally and exactly applied to another case, or that they suit as exactly as if the writer had had the latter point particularly in view;[1] as Diogenes Sinopensis used continually to say concerning himself, that he *fulfilled* and underwent all the curses of tragedy, for he was a vagabond and had no home. Ὅτι αυτὸς ἐκπλήροι καὶ ὑπομένει τὰς ἐκ τῆς τραγωδίας ἀρας.

Similar applications of the phrase *fulfilled* is found in the Syriac, and is perhaps more cogent than the example just mentioned. In the life of St. Ephrem it is said: "And in him (Ephrem) *was fulfilled* the word which was spoken *concerning Paul to Ananias;* he is a vessel of election to me." And St. Ephrem himself, speaking of Aristotle, says, "In him (Aristotle) was *fulfilled* that which was written concerning *Solomon* the wise, that of those who were before or after there has not been equal to him in wisdom."

With such analogous examples before us, we see no reasonable objection to the rendering of the New Testament formula, ἵνα πληρωθῇ and ὅτι πληρωθῇ, *then was fulfilled*, expressing the same as the phrases—"*The declaration of the prophet had an accomplishment in what took place; or, his words may be aptly applied to it; or, his observation is true in reference to the present case.*"

We can have no hesitation in putting such construction on these phrases when we consider the language and idiom of the New Testament writers in general. Their style and genius being Jewish or Rabbinic, we must regard the phrase in question as analogous to the Rabbinic. לְקַיֵּם

[1] Sykes's Essay upon the Truth of the Christian Religion.

מַה שֶּׁנֶּאֱמַר (to establish that which was written) is frequently applied to events different from such as are obviously described in the passages to which it alludes.[1]

In short, we maintain that, whatever objection be urged *à priori* against the theory of "double sense," we should nevertheless adopt it, provided it could satisfactorily be proved that such an exposition was countenanced by Christ and His Apostles. But, before calling in double sense to explain their declarations, we must first make sure that those declarations cannot be explained without multiplicity of senses. Now, since it appears that the phrases they employ do not necessarily involve a double meaning, we adhere to the opinion, that the *Holy Scriptures, like other writings, have only one meaning.*

[1] See the subject largely discussed in Davidson's Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 481, *seq.*

Messianic Prophecies.

Among all the sacred oracles of the Old Testament, those referring to the advent of Messiah and His kingdom occupy the most prominent position, as they constitute the culminating points of Divine revelation. The desires of all nations—the longings of humanity—find in them their appropriate complements.

Since man fell from his original condition of innocence and purity, thereby separating himself from his Maker, and his sins required an atonement and reconciliation to God, there has been left in the bosom of humanity an innate, natural craving after One, who is to restore the golden age of purity, with the lost happiness—the bright era of the world's renovation.

Among the Jews, the belief in such a Saviour assumed the form of regular documents. In studying the promises and predictions of their patriarchs and prophets, they were able to understand not only the nature of His propitiatory work, but also the time of His advent. Hence the nearer the time approached which has been predicted by the prophets, the more did their hope ripen into expectation.

That the Samaritans also, who believed in the Pentateuch only as their inspired canon, were alive to this expectation, is seen from the intercourse of our Lord with the woman of Samaria, who said, "I know that Messias *cometh* (οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται), who is called Christ; when he has come, he will tell us all things."[1] Nor was this belief limited to the descendants of Abraham, to whom the sacred oracles were committed; the heathen, also, were not strangers to the promise of a Restorer of primeval happiness and a Saviour of mankind. Their knowledge did not consist in vague anticipations, as is generally supposed; but the more we study their writings, the more shall we be surprised to find that, it rather assumes, in many instances, the form of a settled principle of belief, based upon the tradition of a primeval golden age of the world's history, from whence their hope for the future pallingenesis of our species takes its origin.

Confucius,[2] in endeavouring to restore the lost happiness of his people by a spiritual reformation—by improving their minds and ennobling their souls—used the means of constantly holding before them the recollection of former days of happiness and primeval felicity. Failing in his endeavours, he promised them—according to their sacred book Tshoung-young—"A GREAT HOLY ONE, who shall appear in the latter days, to whom nations look forward as fading flowers thirst for rain.

"He shall be born of a virgin, whose name shall be (Yeu-vang) Prince of Peace. It shall be the prerogative

---

[1] John iv. 25.

[2] Confucius, Kon-Fu-Dsu, signifying *celebrated teacher* (of the Chinese), was born in the year 551 before the Christian era. See Mémoires concernant l'histoire les Sciences, les Arts, les Mœurs, les Usages des Chinois, par les Missionares de Peking; Stuhr's Chinesische Religion, p. 30; and Schmitt, Uroffenbarung, p. 225.

of that 'most holy one'—the holy one of all ages and nations—to unite all rays of wisdom, and to attain to the perfection of all virtues. His all-penetrating spirit, his prudence, virtues, and counsels, shall govern the world without the prestige of power. The nobility of his soul, his magnanimity and humility, will unite all interests and win all hearts. The nations seeing him shall prostrate themselves before him, and hearing him, they shall be convinced, and with one voice praise his works. The whole world shall re-echo with the praise of his name and glory.

"CHINA SHALL SEE THE RAYS OF HIS GLORY APPROACHING, which shall penetrate even to the savage nations and to the unapproachable wildernesses, or there where no ship can reach."

Zoroaster says in the sacred book of the Persians called Zendavesta (word of life), that "in the last time a man shall appear, named Oshandeberga, *i. e.*, man of the world, who will adorn the world with religion and righteousness. During his time, Peetiarch also will appear, and greatly injure the interests of his kingdom for seventy years. Afterwards, Osideberga will manifest himself to the inhabitants of the world, promote righteousness, destroy iniquity, and restore the ancient order of things. Kings shall obey him, and all his undertakings shall prosper. He will give the victory to true religion. In his time rest and peace shall prevail, all dissensions cease, and all grievances be done away."

Neither were the Greeks strangers to anticipation of the return of the golden age. Hesiod says:—

"Oh, would that Nature had denied me birth
'Midst this fifth race, this iron age of earth;

That long before within the grave I lay,
Or long hereafter would behold the day:
Corrupt the race, with toils and grief oppress'd,
Nor day nor night can yield a pause of rest."[1]

Hence originated the doctrine concerning the great year of the world, when all things will return to their original condition.

The same hope is expressed in the *fourth* Eclogue of Virgil, which is generally supposed to refer to the advent of Messiah, derived from the predictions in the Sybilline books of the Romans.

It is difficult to determine the origin of these hopes and expectations; whether they have been derived from the Jewish oracles, the report of which had spread to other nations, or whether they are to be traced to some other sources. We think it by no means improbable, or derogatory to Divine revelation, to maintain—in the case, at least, of such men as Confucius—that a special revelation was vouchsafed to them.

One conclusion, however, may fairly be deduced from these considerations, namely, that the idea of a Deliverer of the human species is not foreign to the human mind; but, on the contrary, it seems to be like an original and intuitive principle of belief.

The historical proof of the existence of the Almighty Creator, which is drawn from its belief even by the most uncultivated nations, and our remarks with respect to Divine inspiration,[2] find here also their fit application.

He, "by whom all things were made," has so constituted the human mind as to be capable of the belief

[1] Works of Days, v. 174, Elton's version.
[2] *Vide sup.*, p. xlviii.

in those records which have been published with regard to His advent, as soon as they are presented to him; yea, more, He has implanted in man's bosom the desire for a Mediator who would stand between him and an offended God, in order to prepare the heart for His reception.

A belief thus imbued into their minds and hearts obtained a firm hold upon them; because men will more readily believe in a truth which is supported by an internal desire, arising from a felt want of it, than they will yield to one which they derive by a process of reasoning or speculation.

This felt want, then, disposed them to look for some rays of hope, either in the superstitious creations of their own imaginations, or in the records conveyed to them from the Jewish patriarchs and prophets, or, it may be, by a special Divine communication made to their great leaders and sages.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, there is a wide difference between their belief and that of the Jews. The hope which lived in the heart of the Jews for the advent of Messiah was based upon a regular series of emphatic annunciations and promises of Jehovah, under whose special government and protection they believed themselves to be.

The expectation of a Messiah was so much interwoven with the whole theocratic institute—every ordinance in it was so much designed to inculcate the doctrine, and hold out the hope of a coming Saviour—that with all their ignorance and misconception with respect to His character and work in particular, none of them could have been left ignorant of the promises of His advent and His mediatorial work, considered as a mere general fact.

The Jews, as God's peculiar people, were thus favoured

above all nations of the earth with the meridian brightness of spiritual light. "To them pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises."[1] The name which they gave to their expected Saviour and Mediator is מָשִׁיחַ, Messiah, or Anointed.[2] In him they expected a Prince and a Saviour, a vicegerent of the theocracy.

Upon what foundation the Jewish hope has been based is the object of the following treatise to demonstrate.

[1] Rom. ix. 4.

[2] See Ps. ii. and Dan. ix. 25.

Messianic Prophecies of the Old Testament.

We now proceed to consider the Messianic promises contained in the Old Testament Scriptures, as in the Law, the Psalms, and in the Prophets.[1]

We shall endeavour to exhibit those promises and predictions, in the successive stages of their historic development; from general promises of a Saviour of our race, to the most minute and specific annunciations of his character, person, and kingdom.

And with respect to this department of God's oracles, the dictum of the inspired Apostle will be fully realized, that "the word of prophecy is a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in our hearts." Every successive description of Messianic prophecy will add to the hues and lineaments of the promised Saviour, until his picture is vivid and complete. But the portrait thus vividly and graphically drawn by the inspired writers of the Old Testament, receives its true animation—becomes certain and unmistakeable—when contemplated in the light shed upon it by the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

[1] The Messianic promises of the "Prophets" we shall consider in a separate volume.

The First Promise.

The first Messianic promise, called *Protoevangelium*, was given to our first parents in Paradise, immediately after their fall from a state of innocence. This promise, the most general and obscure, is at the same time the most comprehensive and profound. The work of redemption alone unfolds its mystery to perfect light; the Gospel alone is the key to this hieroglyph.

After the serpent had succeeded in turning one of the finest trees of Paradise into a tree of death, and thus to sow the seed of death and ruin in the bosom of the new creation, the Lord God still found the means of defeating the ends of the wicked one, by bringing good out of this evil.

In pronouncing the curse upon all who were concerned in the transgression, the Lord graciously alleviated the same, with words of comfort to the human race, predicting their final victory over him, who plotted their fall:—

Genesis III.

Ver. 14. And the Lord God said unto the serpent, "Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.

15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel."

Ver. 14.—The serpent shall henceforth become a loathing to the human race, for having been the means of their fall. The whole animal kingdom being created for the service of man, hence, as soon as it becomes the means of his sin, it deserves death according to the law of the Old Testament (Lev. xx. 15): "God acts towards mankind like a father who destroys the sword by which his beloved child was hurt" (Calvin).

In ver. 15, the issue of the contest between man and his arch-enemy is predicted. "He shall bruise thy head," the only vulnerable part of the serpent, "and thou shalt bruise his heel," which is the least vulnerable organ of the human frame. Thus the serpent shall be utterly crushed, while it shall inflict only a slight injury. This sense is brought out by the Syriac version: ܗܘ ܢܫܘܦ ܪܫܟ ܘܐܢܬ ܬܫܘܦ ܥܩܒܗ "He shall crush thy head, and thou shalt wound his heel."

The verb שׁוּף has the same meaning as in Job ix. 17, where the learned Schultens remarks "*hic et in nobile vaticinio* Gen. iii. 15, *a plerisque redditur, comminuere, conterere, contundere.*" So Aben Ezra and Ben Melech say: עִנְיָן כֵּהָה וּכְתִיתָה, "it denotes to strike and wound."

Besides the Targum of Jonathan (who explains this verse, וַעֲתִידִין אַינוּן לְמֶעְבַּד שְׁפִיוּתָא בְּעַקְבָא בְּיוֹמָא מְשִׁיחָא, "And they will make a wound in the heel in the days of Messiah," and the note of the Jerusalem Targum, בְּיוֹמָא דְמַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא, "in the day of the King Messiah"), none of the Jewish commentators found here a Messianic allusion; this prophecy being but an obscure outline which was left to be filled up by subsequent prophetic declarations, and the Gospel history alone can explain it to perfection.

Thus runs the sacred narrative, in language of exquisite simplicity. The words drop "like showers upon the tender herb." The whole is as natural as if told by an eye-witness, and is evidently the authentic history as it has been handed down from the parents of mankind.

But in order that we may clearly and fully under-

stand the nature of that melancholy transaction which "blasted the bloom of creation," and the promise couched in the terms of ver. 15, it is necessary that we should first ascertain, who the tempter was that seduced our first parents. It was the general belief of the ancients, that the devil was the chief agent in the seduction; that he used the mask of a serpent, or made that subtile beast his instrument.

I. The Book of Wisdom (chap. ii. 24) says, "*Through the envy of the devil sin came into the world.*" The Palestine Jews called Satan "*the old serpent,*" נָחָשׁ הַקַּדְמוֹנִי הוּא שָׂטָן יֵצֶר הָרַע, "the old serpent is Satan the evil desire."[1]

The Zohar on Gen. iii. 1 says, וְהַנָּחָשׁ דָּא יֵצֶר הָרַע דָּא מַלְאָךְ הַמָּוֶת וּבְגִין דְּנָחָשׁ אִיהוּ מַלְאָךְ הַמָּוֶת גָּרַם מוֹתָא לְכָל עָלְמָא, "And the serpent, that is the evil desire, the angel of death. And because the serpent is the death-angel, it caused death to the whole world."

II. This is further confirmed by the myths of heathen nations.

The Phœnicians and Egyptians, by a perversion of the original records, worship the serpent as an *ἀγαθοδαίμων*.

The Persians are more faithful to the original tradition. According to their sacred book Zendavesta, "*The parents of the human race Meshiah and Meshianeh were created by God pure and good, and destined for happiness, on condition of humility and obedience to the requirements of the law, and purity in their thoughts, words, and deeds, but betrayed by the cruel 'Ahriman'* (Angramainyus), *who from the beginning sought only to*

[1] Eisenmenger. Entdecktes Judenthum, I., p. 822.

deceive;" and again, "*The serpent is the first creature by which Ahriman corrupted the new world, Airyana-vaêge, created by Ormuzd.*"

These, and similar heathen traditions, lead us back to a primeval, golden age of the world's history, and afford presumptive evidence that the sacred narrative of Genesis iii. is founded upon real transactions, pregnant with deep significance.

III. The testimony of Christ and his Apostles leaves us no room for doubt on the subject.

(1.) Our Saviour says to the Jews, "Ye are of your father the devil . . . he was a murderer from the beginning," John viii. 44.

(2.) The Apostle says, "He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth from the beginning," 1 John iii. 8, and

(3.) What serves as a direct elucidation of our passage is Rev. xii. 9, "*And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the devil and Satan, who deceiveth the whole world.*"

It is, indeed, easy to perceive why Moses did not lift the veil which hides the lofty import of the narrative under consideration; because, as a faithful historian, he was not at liberty to comment upon the authentic record; and moreover, because the simple unadorned history itself, is sufficient to lead the reflecting reader to infer some supernatural agency.

"To have told more would have been to encourage the Jews in the destructive superstition which was so prevalent among the other nations of the east" (Rosenm).[1]

[1] This will also account for the rare mention which Moses makes of evil spirits.

Having thus proved that Satan, who employed the serpent as the instrument of his device, was the chief agent in the plot, it follows that the promised conqueror, who stands in opposition to the seducer, must be the "*seed of the woman*," κατ' ἐξοχην—the illustrious son of man—the *second Adam*, "*who is the Lord from heaven.*"

How much or how little our first parents understood this prophecy is not for us to determine. To say that they saw only a faint glimmer of the light which was to dawn upon the earth, is to say that they lived four thousand years before the Christian dispensation. Thus much, however, is certain, that the promise contained in the annunciation (ver. 15) was calculated to wipe away their tears shed over the lost happiness of Eden, and to inspire them with hope and confidence. They were told, that, he who had allured them to ruin, should not always enjoy the victory over them, but should, in turn, be utterly destroyed by their posterity. His head should be crushed by the seed of that woman whom he beguiled—

> "And enraged might see
> How all his malice served only to bring forth
> Infinite goodness, grace, and mercy shown
> On man by him seduced; but on himself
> Treble confusion, wrath and vengeance pour'd."

"Thus this prophecy, uncertain and obscure, like the age to which it belongs, lies mysteriously at the threshold of Paradise, like a venerable sphinx before the ruins of a mystic temple.

"From it proceeds the great historical process in which the promised salvation becomes clearer and more visible. In Shem, it is fixed to a certain tribe; in Abraham, to a certain nation; and in Judah, to a

certain family. But the son of Mary, the second Adam, who was bruised for us in order that he might crush the head of the serpent, He only cleared up this riddle to perfection, by his achieved conquest over the arch-enemy of God and mankind."[1]

Genesis III. 20.

The relation, which this first promise bears to the work of redemption, will appear the more natural, when we remember that it is the nature of every perfect system of tuition to state general principles first, and then to elucidate those principles by subsequent explanations. And as it is the object of an immediate Divine revelation to teach mankind to know God, and their duty towards Him, hence it is reasonable to expect, that his first intimation regarding himself, in the person of his Son our Mediator, should contain the germ of all subsequent Messianic promises.

And whilst the Church, in all ages, has prayerfully contemplated the completion of this prophecy—when Satan's kingdom shall be utterly destroyed, and the Saviour's kingdom of righteousness and peace be established—the immediate effect it produced upon the inhabitants of Paradise is remarkable.

We are told by the inspired historian, in connexion with the narrative we have just considered, that—

> "*Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living*"[2] (Gen. iii. 20).

The woman, of whom he said before the promise—

[1] Delitzsch. Die Genesis, p. 132.

[2] Eve, חַוָּה, is a p. n. derived from חָיָה, *to live;* hence the preserver of life; Symm. *ζωογόνος.*

> "*Her whom thou hast placed with me, she gave me of the fruit and I did eat*" (ver. 12),

she, whom he blamed as the cause of this death and chaos by which he saw himself surrounded, the same became the "source of life" to the whole race.

Thus the phænomenon of the domain of nature—where death, the complete dissolution of an existing generation, becomes the source of life to a new one—repeats itself in the spiritual kingdom. God brought life out of death, incurred by man's transgression.

Genesis IV. 1.

It is also this new relation, into which our first parents entered with God, as a God of promise, that gave rise to the joy which Eve experienced when she gave birth to her first son, Cain. She joyfully exclaimed—

> קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה, "*I have obtained a man from Jehovah*" (Gen. iv. 1).

But as commentators are in the habit of putting a construction upon this passage which it will by no means bear, and as in the following pages we shall frequently have occasion to animadvert upon such species of criticism, irrespective of the authority of the expositor who gives it currency, we would state here, once for all, what is our opinion with respect to the tendency of such exegesis.

It is our conviction, that zeal for that which is unquestionably the truth and doctrine of Scripture, when coupled with superficial knowledge of the language of the sacred writers, has done more mischief to the cause of truth, than infidelity could have ever inflicted. For

when orthodox writers seek to defend the truth upon defenceless ground, they lose the confidence of every honest inquirer, and draw suspicion upon the cause which they plead.

We can easily understand, why those who approach the word of God with some ulterior end in view—with some preconceived dogma which they are determined to defend—should twist the language of Scripture to chime with their favourite creed; but how shall we account for the strange paradox of orthodox expositors, who mix up with sound arguments baseless pleading, and thus effect a breach in their own wall of defence?

A fair illustration of the foregoing remark is afforded by the rendering of this passage:—

"I have obtained a man Jehovah." יְהוָה, *Jehovah*, is thus construed in apposition to אִישׁ, *man*.

Eve is accordingly represented as being *highly enlightened* by the spirit of prophecy in declaring her promised seed to be *Jehovah himself*, whilst she is at the same time strangely *mistaking Cain for the promised seed*.[1]

The reason why expositors were led into this view of the passage is to be found in the supposed difficulty connected with the word אֵת. This is an illustrative particle, corresponding to the Lat. *scilicet*, namely; and because it most frequently stands before the acc. case, hence the rendering אֵת יְהוָה, "*the Jehovah*." To elude this imaginary difficulty, Gesenius translates it "*with (the help of) Jehovah*," as this particle sometimes stands for the prep. *with*. This is however liable to the objection that it should be עִם יְהוָה, as in 1 Sam. xiv. 45.

[1] Pye Smith's Scripture Testimony, I. p 228-234.

But all difficulties vanish, when we translate אֵת *from*, which we are justified in doing, when we find the word occurring *three* times in this sense even in the Pentateuch itself, viz., Gen. xliv. 4, הֵם יָצְאוּ אֶת־הָעִיר, "they have gone forth from the city" (Engl. vers. *out of*); also Ex. ix. 29; and Num. xxxv. 26.

It may, perhaps, be objected, that in all these instances referred to, אֵת is connected with the verb יָצָא, to go forth from a place, and in such connexion it corresponds to the Lat. acc. *egredi urbem*, but in all other cases the word has no such designation.

But when we analyze the verb קָנָה, we shall find that it is nearly allied to the verb יָצָא, both having the same leading idea.

קָנָה denotes to buy, to get by purchase; hence the act by which an object *passes* (יָצָא) from the possession of one person to another. The English version is therefore quite correct in rendering like the Chaldee,[1] "*I have gotten a man from Jehovah*;" and commentators should have better foregone the advantage to be derived from the rendering "*the man Jehovah.*"

Yet, without putting too much into these words, we think them highly significant. The joy expressed by the exclamation "*I have gotten a man!*" shows us that, Eve saw in this, her first-born son, the earnest of the promised seed. For how could she else have rejoiced at the birth of a new man into a world, which lies under the curse, where the whole creation is groaning under its crushing burden, where all are born to die? In this

[1] The Targum Onkeles: קְנִיתִי גַבְרָא מִן קֳדָם יְיָ, and Syr. ܩܢܝܬ ܓܒܪܐ ܠܡܪܝܐ, I have obtained a man to the Lord; Sept. ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

exclamation, then, the state of their feelings is depicted to us—we see them turning their eyes from the present state of things, and concentrating their hopes in the future. God's promise is their guiding star, directing them to Him who is to regain Paradise.

Salvation from Shem.

Genesis IX. 20-28.

It is the grand characteristic of the golden age of the world's history as recorded by Moses, that the most important and momentous events spring from causes apparently insignificant and fortuitous.

In reading that history, we are constantly reminded that we have to do with giants of our race—giants, not only in years and stature, but also in historical significance.

Adam is not only the progenitor of the human species, but also the representative of that covenant, in which the destinies of all his posterity were bound up, "whose fall brought death into the world and all our woe."

A dying patriarch utters words through the Divine afflatus, which form the programme of future history.[1]

Thus Noah—the Adam of the postdiluvian world—utters prophetic words, which find their echo in the events of remotest ages, and determine the fate of nations.

Ver. 20. After the flood, "Noah commenced the cultivation of the soil." He was also the first who united with husbandry the cultivation of the vine. But even that righteous man did not escape the danger connected with such an employment.

[1] See our exposition on Gen. xlix. 10.

21. "He tasted the wine, was inebriated, and uncovered himself within his tent."

22. "And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father," and with unnatural and impious disrespect, "spoke of it to his brethren."

23. "But Shem and Japheth," with tender modesty and filial love and reverence, grieved at their father's disgrace, "took a garment, laid it upon their shoulders, and went backward and covered the nakedness of their father."

24. And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his youngest son had done unto him.

25. He said: "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants, עֶבֶד עֲבָדִים, the meanest of servants shall he be to his brethren."

The malediction is not directed to Ham, but to Canaan—not to the transgressor, but to his youngest son. We agree with Hofmann and Drechsler[1] in assigning as the reason of this, that as Ham, the youngest son of Noah, has caused his father so much grief, so should his youngest son be a source of disgrace to him. This law of retribution seems to be emphatically pointed out, ver. 24, in the expression בְּנוֹ הַקָּטֹן, "his youngest son." This is the outbursting of holy indignation, spoken in the power of the Spirit of God, and hence its resistless effect in determining the fate of nations.

Canaan has actually become the menial servant of his brethren. That he has become the servant of Shem, let

[1] Quoted by Delitzsch, on Genesis, p. 206, whom we have principally followed in the exposition of this section.

the expulsion of his descendants from the promised land, and the reduction to abject servitude of those whom the Israelites spared, bear witness (Josh. ix. 23). That he has become the servant of Japheth, let the subjection of Tyrus and Carthage to the Greeks and Romans testify. Hannibal seems to have had a foreboding of this curse when he exclaimed in terror while a child, "*agnosco fortunam Carthaginis.*"

Here it may be asked, "how do we reconcile this mode of retribution with the Divine justice? Why should all the descendants of Canaan suffer for the sin of Ham?" To this we reply:—

1. Noah discriminated in his youngest son those mental characteristics which would stamp themselves upon his descendants; he saw in those feelings which prompted his impious deed the germ of their national character, which character is already developed and matured before his prophetic view.

Noah's curse, therefore, rests upon the descendants of Canaan in so far as the sin of their father became the type of their spiritual and moral nature; and thus connected by a link of national depravity and debasement, they are all contemplated as one individual. That the wanton lasciviousness of Ham prevailed among the descendants of Canaan, as well as idolatry, is seen in Sodom and Gomorrah, in the description given to us of the inhabitants of the promised land (Lev. xxiii. 20; Deut. xii. 13), and in the proverbial moral depravity of the Phœnicians and Carthaginians.[1]

Let it be borne in mind, that the spiritual and moral relation subsisting between father and children assumed,

[1] *Vide* Munster, Religion der Carthager, p. 250.

in the ancient world, a hereditary character, owing to the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed. Among them, individuality is almost lost in the stereotyped nationality, and thus the nation forms a *persona moralis*.

The spirit of Christianity alone gives more prominence to individual character; the Gospel alone contemplates man as an independent being and responsible agent, in the light of his own character and doings.

2. The sentence here pronounced upon Canaan is not one of condemnation, which would exclude his posterity from salvation. The servitude, indeed, is a national calamity, but it may be the means of bringing those to repentance and salvation, who do not share in the national guilt.

It may thus be strictly maintained, that every one suffers for his own sin; for every individual who is free from the national guilt experiences in the national chastisement only the manifestations of a father's love correcting him.

Ver. 26.—Now, after inflicting the curse upon Canaan, Noah continues to pronounce the benediction upon his other two sons, Shem and Japheth. His blessing upon the former takes the form of an exclamation; as if seeing the spiritual privileges which the Lord shall bestow upon Shem, he breaks forth with praise and thanks on his behalf, בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי שֵׁם, "blessed be Jehovah (who is) the God of Shem!"

These oracular declarations are, from their very nature, sententious; brief and comprehensive—full of import—they bring before our minds the whole subsequent history of Shem (Israel)—a history replete with Divine favours towards that nation, as towards his

chosen and peculiar people. And this endearing relationship is implied in the name יְהוָה, Jehovah. This name the Lord, out of the burning bush, sent as a watchword to Israel in Egypt.

When Moses said unto God, "Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, the God of your fathers has sent me unto you, and they shall say unto me, what is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, אֶהְיֶה, the I AM has sent me unto you," Exod. iii. 13.

Not אֱלֹהִים, Elohim, which expresses his general relation to the world as the creator of the universe (Gen. i. 1), but Jehovah, יְהוָה, *ὁ ὤν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*,[1] the Covenant God of your fathers has sent me.

Ver. 27.—The blessing upon Japheth is clothed in the form of a paranamasia, suggested by his name. יֶפֶת is derived from פָּתָה, pateo; *πετανύω*, to open, expand, enlarge.[2] יַפְתְּ אֱלֹהִים לְיֶפֶת, God shall enlarge (like הִרְחִיב) to Japheth, he shall extend his possessions.

This would, however, refer only to his temporal prosperity; but he goes still further in saying, וְיִשְׁכֹּן בְּאָהֳלֵי שֵׁם, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem. "Those tents of Zion which the Lord has chosen for his habitation" (Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14); that peculiar relationship,

[1] See my Grammar, § 192.

[2] This form of poetic diction of the Hebrews—which occurs most frequently in the writings of Moses—though it may at first sight appear to be a mere affectation and artificial mode of expression, will be found to have its basis in the constitution of the human mind, which, when highly excited, desires that language should exhibit the objects sensibly by the very sound. Hence, both children, as well as nations of simple manners, evince a great fondness for play upon words. In Homer, we find many examples of it, also in such writers as Sophocles, Cicero, Petrarch, and Shakspeare. Compare our remarks on paranomasia, *supra*.

primarily the promise and privilege of Shem, shall be extended to Japheth. This view of the passage is taken by Calvin, who says, "Temporale fore dissidium inter Sem et Japhet, deinde venturum tempus quo rursus coalescant in unum corpus et commune habeant domicilium—Deus enim nova adoptione unum populum ex diversis effecit et fraternam unitatem sancivit inter alienos."

According to this rendering, וְיִשְׁכֹּן, *and he shall dwell*, is the predicate to the immediate antecedent, viz., *Japheth*.

Others follow the Chaldee, וְיִשְׁרֵי שְׁכִנְתֵּיהּ בְּמִשְׁכְּנֵיהּ דְּשֵׁם, and he [viz., God] shall cause his Shechina to rest in the tents of Shem: the sense will be, accordingly—the Lord shall bless Japheth with temporal prosperity, but as to the indwelling of the שְׁכִינָה, Shechinah—the spiritual blessings—these are the exclusive privileges of Shem.

We can see nothing to be urged against this interpretation, unless, perhaps, in that case the subject יְהוָה would be repeated. But even that objection loses its force when the brevity of the oracular language is taken into account.

We have chosen the former interpretation, which makes Japheth the subject of the verb יִשְׁכֹּן, because it takes in, a wider range of historical facts; it introduces us into a period when the middle-wall of partition between Shem and Japheth shall be removed—when both Jew and Gentile shall be gathered in, and united in one church of their covenant God.[1]

Thus, whilst Canaan is three times cursed as a slave to his brethren, Shem is blessed with spiritual blessings,

[1] See Eph. ii. 13-22.

Japheth with temporal, but at the same time with the prospect of being one day the recipient of Shem's privileges. We have then for the first time the intimation given to us where, in the dispersion and heaving of the nations, we have to look for the salvation of the human race. It is to the Shemitish tribe that the finger of God is pointing.

By tracing the genealogy of the different nations given in the subsequent chapters, we come to the patriarchs, to whom the promises are given in a more definite form.

The Call of Abraham.

GENESIS XII. 1-3.

Ver. 1. The Lord said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee.

2. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing.

3. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and through thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

The patriarch Abraham—the friend of God—the father of the faithful—is the representative of the Shemitish tribe, through whom salvation was to come to the human race. In him, the blessing pronounced upon Shem assumes a covenant character.

The call of Abraham from the idolatrous house of Terah, from his country and kindred, to a land appointed for him by God, and the promises therewith connected, were unquestionably dictated by Divine grace; yet it is important to notice that the Lord, in investing him with this sublime dignity, had special regard to him—not in his individual, but in his representative capacity—as the head of a nation through whom the knowledge of Jehovah and his spiritual worship was to be spread throughout the whole earth, and perpetuated to the end of time. "Shall I," says the righteous Judge of the

Universe, "hide from Abraham that thing which I do; seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed through him? For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, that they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."[1]

Abraham may thus be regarded as standing in a position antithetical to that of Canaan, and our remarks with reference to the relationship of the one, will hold good in respect of the other.

Abraham, by faith, obeyed the Divine call, and set out not knowing whither he went; yet the Lord directed his steps toward that land then inhabited by the Canaanites, among whom he was a stranger, גֵּר.[2] Nevertheless, it was destined to be the inheritance of his posterity, whence the light was to go forth to enlighten the whole world.

The passage more immediately bearing upon our subject is found in the last clause of ver. 3:—

וְנִבְרְכוּ בְךָ כֹּל מִשְׁפְּחוֹת הָאֲדָמָה, "And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."[3]

This promise is repeated after the trial of his faith in

---

[1] Gen. xviii. 17-20.

[2] Instead of deriving גֵּר from גוּר, to dwell, Aben Ezra derives it from נָרַר, to shake off (fruit from a tree); the object is thus represented as being torn from his genial and native soil.

[3] "The assertion of Berthold, that 'all the families of the earth' here refers to the nations of Canaan, may be considered as refuted, by comparing this with Gen. xviii. 18 and xxiii. 18, where the expression גּוֹי הָאָרֶץ, 'the nations of the earth' is employed; and, on the other hand, with Gen. xv. 16, where the nations of Canaan appear antagonistic to the descendants of Abraham."—Hofman's Weissagung u. Erfullung, I., p. 96.

his readiness to offer up his son Isaac,[1] and is ratified to Isaac,[2] as also to Jacob.[3]

On comparing these passages, we find differences in the phraseology employed:—

1. In this place, the word בְּךָ is used, signifying "in thee." In Gen. xxii. 18 and xxvi. 4, בְּזַרְעֶךָ is used, signifying "in thy seed;" while in Gen. xxviii 4, we find both terms, בְּךָ וּבְזַרְעֶךָ, "in thee and in thy seed."

This difference corroborates, we think, our remarks, namely, that the patriarchs and the promised seed are contemplated as identical.

2. There is another difference of form which we notice, viz., instead of the niphal, נִבְרְכוּ, "shall be blessed," as used here, we have in Gen. xxii. 18 and xxvi. 4 the hithpael conjugation, הִתְבָּרְכוּ, "they shall bless themselves." The latter signifies that the nations shall wish for themselves the blessing of Abraham and his seed, while the former expresses that the seed of Abraham shall be the means of blessing to all nations.

The Apostle Paul makes this passage bear an exclusive reference to Christ: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made: he saith not, Unto seeds (בְּזַרְעֵיךָ, τοῖς σπέρμασιν), as of many, but as of one (בְּזַרְעֲךָ, τῷ σπέρματί σου), And to thy seed, which is Christ."[4]

How are we to understand this reference of the Apostle? Commentators are in the habit of considering it as an argumentation, as if the Apostle reasoned, from the use of the singular, that it refers to Christ and not to the descendants of Abraham generally; for in that case the plural would be employed. Thus Bloomfield:

---

[1] Gen. xxii. 18.
[2] Gen. xxvi. 4.
[3] Gen. xxviii. 14.
[4] Gal. iii. 16.

"To the Apostle's interpretation of τῷ σπέρματί, and to the mode of taking σπέρμασιν adopted by him, several recent commentators have presumed to take exception; maintaining that σπέρμα, in the promise to Abraham, is not meant—as Paul takes it—of Messiah, but of Christians in general. But the former view is ably vindicated by Beza, Whitby, and especially Koppe, Borger, and Schott, who have found that the interpretation is given in the Rabbinical writers, and that the mode of argumentation here adopted is quite *Jewish* (!) and therefore suitable to the occasion."[1] What is Jewish argumentation but a *fraus pia* under a decorous epithet? Are the inspired writings of the Apostle, then, to be brought into the category of Rabbinical quibbling? If the reasoning be fallacious, the term "*Jewish*" will not cover it, but must be looked upon as totally incompatible with the character of an Apostle. We, therefore, think that the Apostle does not mean to draw his argument from the terms in which the promise is conveyed (for it must have been evident to himself that זֶרַע may be taken either in the singular or plural collectively; hence no fair inference can be drawn from it) but regard it simply as an exposition of the passage in question, viz., the Lord, in this promise to Abraham, had in view as the culminating point of its fulfilment, "the Lord Jesus Christ, whose day Abraham saw afar off, and was glad."[2]

This exposition of the Apostle is confirmed by the

[1] Notes on the New Testament.

[2] We find the same view of the passage taken by Prof. Brown, who says, "The truth is, there is no ground to suppose that it is the statement of an argument at all; it is just as Riccaltoun observes, 'a critical expository remark.'"—Comm. on Gal., p. 144.

historic fact, that no blessing accrued to all the nations of the earth except through the Messiah.

Thus, the Messianic promise of the patriarchal age becomes more distinct, both by the nature of the annunciation as well as by its frequent repetition and confirmation. The last patriarch bequeaths it to his posterity, to whom it becomes a vital principle, forming their national character.

Shiloh.

Genesis XLIX. 8-12.

Ver. 1. And Jacob called his sons, and said,
Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that
Which shall befall you in the latter days.

The patriarch Jacob, before his death, calls his twelve sons together, to reveal unto them that which shall befall them in the latter days: בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים. As he sees his sons surrounding his death-bed, his soul kindles with the spirit of Jehovah. He—the last of the patriarchs—is about to depart from them, and they are about to enter upon their national existence.

He sees the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel, for whom the boundaries of the nations were reserved (Deut. xxii. 8), which he divides among them with regal power and authority. Yea, his prophetic vision pierces beyond the confines of Canaan and its theocratic institutes to *the advent of the promised seed*, in whom all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, even the Prince of Peace, who shall unite all families of the earth under his sway; in a word, he realizes in them the earnest of that promise, "*The land whereon thou liest to thee will I give it, and unto thy seed, and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed*" (Gen. xxviii. 13, 14).

And it is natural to expect that the last prophecy of the patriarch on that solemn occasion, furnishing as it does a programme, as it were, of the history of his people during several centuries to come, should surpass many subsequent Messianic predictions both in clearness and comprehensiveness.

At the very opening of the address, we are led to expect a revelation of the distant future by the phrase בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים,[1] "*in the latter days*," which generally refers to the advent of Messiah, as Isa. ii. 2, "It shall come to pass in the latter days," &c.; where Kimchi remarks, כָּל מָקוֹם שְׁנֶּאֱמַר בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים הוּא יְמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "Wherever it is said 'in the latter days,' it means the days of the Messiah." On Hos. iii. 5, "Afterwards the children of Israel shall return, and seek Jehovah their God and David their king . . . in the latter days," Aben Ezra says, אֶת דָּוִד מַלְכָּם וְהוּא הַמָּשִׁיחַ כְּמוֹ וְדָוִד עַבְדִּי נָשִׂיא לָהֶם לְעוֹלָם, "*Their king David means the Messiah, like* [Ezek. xxxvii. 25], *and my servant David shall be their prince for ever.*"

Now follows the prophetic disclosure of the future destinies of each son, or rather, of each tribe represented by Jacob's sons.

Like every oracle, it is delivered with extreme brevity, clothed in figurative language, and bears the germ of the future history and destinies of the Israelitish nation.

Following the order of their ages, he first addresses Reuben, the first-born, who defiled himself with his fornication; he loses his rights and privileges of primogeniture.

The next two sons, Simeon and Levi, who have perpetrated cruelties against the Shechemites, they also lose their father's blessing. The portion of the first two sons is transferred to Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh.

He then addresses Judah, who is styled (1 Chron. v 2) נָגִיד, "Prince among his brethren," as follows:—

[1] The Koran applies the same expression to the day of judgment: آمنّا بِاللّٰهِ وبِاليوم الآخِرِ "We believe in God and in the last day."

Ver. 8. Thou Judah! thy brethren shall praise thee.
Thy hand in the neck[a] of thine enemies,
And thy father's children shall bow down before thee.
9. A young lion is Judah.
From the prey my son thou hast gone up.
He kneels, lurks like a lion,
And like a roaring-lion; who shall [dare to] rouse him?
10. The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
Nor a lawgiver from his posterity,[b]
Until the Peace-bringer come;
And his [shall be] the willing-obedience of the nations.
11. Binding his foal to the vine,
And his ass's colt to the choice-vine,
He washes his garments in wine,
And in the blood of grapes his vesture.
12. Flashing [as to] his eyes from wine.
And white [as to] his teeth from milk.

[a] or, *back.*

[b] lit. *between his feet.*

Ver. 8.—*Judah*, יְהוּדָה, from יָדָה, Hiph. הוֹדָה, to praise, received his name, as at his birth his mother said, "*Now I will praise the Lord*" (Gen. xxix. 35). This name the father takes as a favourable omen to pronounce his benediction (compare the Paranomasia, יַפְתְּ אֱלֹהִים לְיֶפֶת, Gen. ix. 27).

Judah thou! Thy very name is fraught with blessings. It denotes, "thy brethren shall praise thee." "*Thine hand upon the back of thine enemies*" is a Hebrew *usus loquendi*, expressive of "victory,"

viz., thou shalt put them to flight. In allusion to this promise, David says, וְאוֹבַי נָתַתָּ לִי עֹרֶף, And mine enemies thou hast given me the back, Ps. xviii. 42.

Ver. 9.—"*A young lion is Judah.*" This is a prophecy of the conquering dynasty that is to descend from Judah. The lion is the symbol of royalty and victory.[1] From Judah sprang David and Solomon, and Jesus Christ the Eternal King (Matt. i. 2, 3; Heb. vii. 14), who is the conqueror. "*Be comforted,*" said he to his disciples, "*for I have overcome the world*" (John xvi. 33). He has also risen victorious from the field of contest, and "has captured a captivity" from the prince of darkness. In allusion to this passage, he is called "the lion of the tribe of Judah" (Rev. v. 5).

Ver. 10.—The first question presenting itself in this verse is, whether מְחֹקֵק is the synonymous parallel of שֵׁבֶט, meaning, as Hofmann thinks, the "*sceptre*" which the princes of Judah, like all oriental chiefs, held as a support between their feet;[2] or is it to be taken as a synthetic parallel denoting "*lawgiver;*" LXX, ἡγουμενος, like Num. xxi. 18? We prefer the latter, which expands the idea of שֵׁבֶט, *sceptre, referring to him who holds it.*

מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו, *from between his feet*, is equivalent to יוֹצֵא חֲלָצָיו, *he who proceeds from his loins*, i. e., *his posterity*. All Hofmann's objections to this version have no weight; we adopt it as being quite in keeping with the lofty poetic diction of the whole chapter.

"Until Shiloh שִׁילֹה comes." Nearly all commentators, both Jewish and Christian, agree in considering this as a Messianic prophecy.

The three greatest Jewish authorities, viz., the Targums, Talmud, and the Rabbis Bechai, Jarchi, Abarbanel, Kimchi, Bereshith Rabbah, &c., are decided in its favour. Thus—

(1.) Targum Onkelos, עַד דְּיֵיתֵא מְשִׁיחָא דִּדִילֵהּ הִיא מַלְכוּתָא, "Until Messiah come to whom the kingdom belongs."

(2.) The Jerusalem Targum, עַד זִמְנָא דְיֵיתֵא מְשִׁיחָא

---

[1] Homer represents his victorious hero:—

αἵματι καὶ λύθρῳ πεπλαγμένον ὥστε λέοντα
ὅς ῥά τε βεβρωκὼς βοὸς ἔρχεται ἀργαύλοιο.—Odyss. xxii. 402.

[2] Hofmann pleads the Iliad ii. 100-109; in favour of his view, and avers that "the passages 1 Sam. xviii. 10; xix. 9; xxii. 6, where Saul appears with his sceptre in his hand, proves only a want of royal etiquette on the part of that king" (!).

הְדִידֶה הִיא מַלְכוּתָא וְלֵיה עֲתִידִין דְיִשְׁתַּעְבְּדוּן כָּל מַלְכוּתָא הְאַרְעָא, "Until King Messiah come to whom the kingdom belongs, and to him shall all the nations of the earth be subject."

(3.) In the Talmud Tract Sanhedrim, cap. 12, the question "How shall the Messiah be called?" answered שִׁילֹה; as it is written "until Shiloh come."

(4.) Abarbanel *in loc.*, אָמְרוּ בִּבְרֵאשִׁית רַבָּא לִי" שֵׁ"מ זֶה מְשִׁיחַ בֶּן דָּוִד שֶׁהוּא עָתִיד לִרְדוֹת אֶת הַמַּלְכוּת שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר תִּרְעֵם בְּשֵׁבֶט בַּרְזֶל. They said in Bereshith Rabba, "the sceptre, &c., that is Messiah, the son of David, who shall rule the kingdom, as it is written [Ps. ii.], thou shalt break them with an iron rod."

But the greatest diversity of opinion exists with respect to the reading and interpretation of the word שִׁילֹה. *Vox est quae crucem figit interpretibus.* The readings are—

1. שִׁילֹה in the most Jewish MSS. and in the Masoretic reading. The same defective = שִׁלֹה in thirty-eight Jewish MSS. and in all the Samaritan Codices.

2. שֶׁלּוֹ for שִׁלּוֹ = אֲשֶׁר לוֹ. The interpretation, accordingly, depends upon the meaning attached to this word.

I. We are inclined to follow the Masoretic reading, viz., שִׁילֹה, from שָׁלָה and שָׁלָו; Arabic سَلَمَ, *to be secure, safe, at peace;* hence the *author or bringer of peace;* like שְׁלֹמֹה, Solomon, from שָׁלֵם, Arab. سَلِمَ, which is explained, 1 Chron. xxii. 9, by אִישׁ מְנוּחָה, "*a man of rest;*" the same *Shiloh* = "*a man of peace.*"

This interpretation, we think with Hengstenberg, to be liable to no objection, and of having everything in its favour.

a) Its philology is fully sustained, as—

כִּידוֹר, *military tumult*, from כָּדַר, *to be troubled.*
קִימוֹשׁ, or קָמוֹשׁ, *thistle*, from קָמַשׁ, *to pierce*; so
שִׁילֹה, *peace-bringer*, from שָׁלָה, *to be at rest.*[1]

b) It is confirmed by analogous appellations of Messiah.

[1] Jahn's objection to the rendering Pacificator, "that no certain example can be produced where a noun of this form has the active signification," is easily disposed of, by taking it the abstract for the concrete—the *Pacificator*, or embodiment of peace.

Micah (v. 4) says, וְזֶה יִהְיֶה שָׁלוֹם, and this same shall be peace.[1]

In Isa. (ix. 5) he is designated שַׂר שָׁלוֹם, Prince of Peace, and

In the Eph. (ii. 14), *αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν*, for he is our peace.

c) It is also favoured by the connexion more than all the other interpretations.

The import of the passage is, "Judah shall continue to have the superiority and ascendency over the other tribes of Israel, until he enters upon the full possession of transcendant regal power in the person of the Peace-bringer, to whom all the nations of the earth shall ultimately pay willing obedience."

The state of Shiloh's kingdom is then characterized in the following verses (11, 12) as the reign of rural peace and innocence. The foal is bound to the choice vine. Their garments are stained, not with human blood, but with the blood of grapes. Their eyes are flashed, not with the fury of war, but with wine.[2]

II. All ancient versions render it, until he comes unto whom it (viz., the kingdom) belongs.

The LXX. Cod. Vat. *ἕως ἂν ἐλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῳ*, and Cod. Oxon. *ᾧ ἀπόκειται*, and the Syriac, ܕܠܗ ܕܝܢ, he to whom it belongs.

From this, it appears that they read שֶׁלֹּה, or שֶׁלּוֹ, for לוֹ אֲשֶׁר, *which to him.*[3]

This is skilfully defended by Jahn (Einleitung N. T. and Vatc. Mess.) and adopted by Lee (Heb. Lex.). They maintain that the present reading, שִׁילֹה was unknown till about the middle of the

---

[1] See our exposition *in loc., infra.*

[2] The fulfilment of this prophecy is clearly proved from history. Until the time of David, the tribe of Judah enjoyed a pre-eminence. From David to the Babylonish captivity the crown was worn by princes from that family. And it is remarkable that, after the Babylonian exile, whilst the other ten tribes never returned to their native country, Judah was restored and reinstated in his place.

[3] The Targum, as cited above, whom Jarchi and other commentators follow, in rendering מָלֵךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ שֶׁהַמַּלְכוּת שֶׁלּוֹ, "the king Messiah to whom the kingdom belongs," are doubtful as to whether they understand by שִׁילֹה, "Shiloh" the Messiah, and add the following, "to whom the kingdom belongs," by way of explanation; or whether Shiloh is expressed by שֶׁלּוֹ, and מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא, king Messiah, is added by way of illustration. The former is the construction generally put upon it by the Jews, and certainly the most natural one.

tenth century. Up to that time both Jews and Christians read שָׁלֹה, "which to him."

This view is considerably strengthened by the corresponding passage in Ezekiel (xxi. 32 [27]), "*Until he comes,* אֲשֶׁר לוֹ הַמִּשְׁפָּט, *to whom the right belongs,*" i. e., *who is the legitimate heir of this kingdom;* in which passage even Hofmann[1] finds an allusion to Shiloh, שִׁילֹה.

This interpretation is adopted by Dr. Davidson, who "has no hesitation in departing from the Masoretic reading where there appears to be such valid reasons, viz., the reading alleged being older than the Masoretic text."[2]

III. Gesenius, Vater, and others render, "Until peace comes," and find here an indirect reference to Messiah.

IV. Others take Shiloh to denote the name of a city mentioned in Joshua (xviii. 4). It refers, they say, to the leadership which the tribe of Judah enjoyed in marching in the front of the people, "*Until they arrived at Shiloh.*"

This interpretation originated with the modern Jews, to evade the supposed conclusion, to wit, If the dynasty of Judah is to remain until Messiah comes, now that the kingdom of Judah has fallen, the Messiah must have come already.

It has also been adopted by others who failed to see the fulfilment of this prophecy. It has, moreover, recently found an able and ingenious advocate in Delitzsch.[3]

This is the more remarkable, as he pleads the Messianic reference of this passage, though he does not find it in the term שִׁילֹה, but in וְלוֹ יִקְהַת עַמִּים, and to him the obedience of the nations.

The whole, according to him, will read thus: "*The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, &c., until he comes to Shiloh.*" SHILOH BEING THE TURNING POINT IN THE HISTORY OF JUDAH, here the foundation for his future dynasty was laid, and hence "to him (viz. Judah) the obedience of the nations."

The prophecy found its fulfilment in David and Solomon, the mighty monarchs, but its ideal is Jesus Christ. In him, the lion of the tribe of Judah, this prophecy reached its culminating point. Like a lion, he has left the field of contest in triumph and entered into "Shiloh," his eternal rest, "where he rules in his endless power and glory."

---

[1] Weissagung in Erfüllung, I., p. 112, seq. [2] In a letter to the author.
[3] Die Genesis, p. 371.

This exegesis we cannot meet with such objections as Hengstenberg,[1] "that the place Shiloh had no existence at the time of Jacob; it was a mere resting-place of Israel, from whence its name is derived," when we consider that צִידוֹן, *Zidon*, is mentioned in the same chapter, which is certainly of less importance than Shiloh, which is a place of great significance, being associated with the fact, "*and the land was subdued before them*" (Josh. xviii. 1).

Neither is there much weight in Hengstenberg's other objection, viz., "for the want of one adverb of place." The adverb of motion towards a place is expressed in Hebrew by ה, *hê* local, as מִצְרַיְמָה, to Egypt; but this ה suffix is sometimes omitted, as, *e.g.*, וַיָּבֹאוּ אַרְצָה כְּנָעַן, and they came to the land of Canaan,[2] instead of אַרְצָה. Here the omission is regular for the sake of euphony, thus שִׁילֹה for שִׁילֹהָה (two hê's at the end of a word). Such objections, then, are nugatory, if not mere blunders, and leave the position of an opponent untouched.

But we would reply to those who advance this exposition for the sake of getting rid of its Messianic import—

a) Your theory is contrary to tradition. The Jewish fathers had better means of ascertaining the import of this doubtful phrase.

b) According to your exposition, there is a strange transition from the sublime exordium (ver. 1), "That I may tell you that which shall befall you in the latter days," and, again (2), "Judah, thy brethren shall praise thee," &c., to a prediction of a petty leadership which the tribe of Judah is to enjoy, of marching in the front until they come to Shiloh. Not to mention the fact that Moses and Joshua were leaders of the people, though not descendants of Judah.

c) It introduces an incongruity into this verse, and severs it entirely from the following.

And even the very plausible exposition of Delitzsch is not free from some of these objections.

V. The Jonathan Targum, Kimchi, Calvin, Knapp, and others, make Shiloh to denote "*his son*," like the Arab. سَلِيلٌ, with suffix ה for וֹ.

As this has recently been defended by Bade,[3] we must consider it in detail. He renders, "UNTIL HIS SON (or HIS SEED) COMES," for the following reasons (we choose the most important): (1) As all

---

[1] Christology, I., p. 61. [2] Gen. xlv. 25. [3] Christologie.

the preceding Messianic prophecies are given under that designation (Gen. iii. 15; xxvi. 27; xviii. 18, &c.), hence it is natural that the same expression should be used here also. (2) Isaiah applies the names of בֵּן, *son*, יֶלֶד, *child*, יוֹנֵק, *sprout*, to Messiah.

Now, in addition to some of the objections urged against II. and IV., we have to remark that it attaches a new meaning to the word which it will not easily bear. The Arabic word means fœtus: to make it analogous to שִׁלְיָה (Deut. xxviii. 57) is a violent process of inflection.

Why should we adopt forced and far-fetched expositions, which destroy the connexion of the discourse, when we have such an obvious and natural meaning in Shiloh = peace-bringer, favoured by the connexion?

"Indeed," says Herder, "for the best comment upon Jacob's blessings of Judah, we must look to Isaiah. He was himself a descendant of Judah—a royal prophet. He invests the Messiah, the son of David, with all the splendour of his ancestors; he describes him as King, Lion, Conqueror, Prince of Peace, clothed with meekness and pure innocence."[1]

Until, עַד כִּי, is here equivalent to עַד אֲשֶׁר. Aben Ezra, וְאֵין טַעַם עַד כִּי יָבֹא שִׁילֹה שֶׁיָּסִיר הַשֵּׁבֶט מִמֶּנּוּ בְּבוֹא שִׁילֹה רַק טַעֲמוֹ כְּמוֹ לֹא יֶחְסַר לְפִלּוֹנִי לֶחֶם עַד שֶׁנַּנִּיַּח עֵת שֶׁיִּהְיֶה לוֹ שָׂרוֹת וּכְרָמִים (בראשית כח טו), וְרַבּוֹת כָּמוֹהוּ, "It does not mean that the sceptre shall depart from him when Shiloh has come; but it is the same as (to say), this one shall not want bread until the time comes when he shall possess many fields and vineyards. It is the same also in Gen. xxviii. 15." Compare Psalm cx. 1[2] and the Greek ἕως ἂν, Matt. v. 18.

יִקְהַת (Arab. وَقَهَ, *paruit*), willing obedience.

Ver. 11, 12.—אֹסְרִי, partc. kal, with ִי paragogic (like בְּנִי, *the son of*, for בֵּן), *he* or *one* binds. It may either refer to Judah as its subject, or it may be impersonal where the agent is not mentioned, and is descriptive of the state of the people generally. The same applies to כִּבֵּס, pret. piel for the present, *he* or *one* washes. חַכְלִילִי עֵינַיִם, Gesenius translates, "to become dim, dark:" Lee, after the Arab., الْحَاكِل, refreshed (of eyes): we prefer the Syriac ܘܝܼܚ, shining or flashing.

[1] Theologische Briefe, I., p. 62. [2] See our exposition, *infra*.

The Star of Jacob.

Prophecy of Balaam.

It is essential to a right understanding of the following prophecy to consider the occasion on which it was uttered.

The (יְשֻׁרוּן) beloved people of Jehovah, whom he led in the wilderness after their escape from the bondage of Egypt, in a pillar of cloud by day and in a pillar of fire by night—whom Jehovah kept as an apple of his eye—

> "As the eagle stirreth up her nest,
> Hovers over her young,
> Spreadeth her wings, taketh them,
> Beareth them on her wings,
> So the Lord did bear them."[1]

That people, on their journey through the howling wilderness, came, in the fortieth year of their pilgrimage, to Pisgah.

"And they sent messengers to Sihon king of the Amorites, saying, Let me pass through thy land. We will not turn into the field, or into the vineyard; we will not drink of the waters of the well, but we will go along by the king's highway until we pass thy borders." But this friendly and modest request was refused: "Sihon would not suffer Israel to pass through his borders, but gathered all his people together, and went out against Israel in the wilderness. And Israel smote him with the edge of the sword and possessed his land."[2]

"Now Balak the son of Zippor, who was at that time king of the Moabites, saw all that Israel had done to the

[1] Deut. xxxii. 10, 11.

[2] Numb. xxi. ff.

Amorites, and he was sore afraid, lest they come upon him and lick up all that was round about, as the ox licketh up the grass of the field. He sent, therefore, messengers unto the seer Balaam, the son of Beor, saying, Come, I pray thee, curse me this people, for they are too mighty for me."[1]

Balaam followed the call of Balak, but, subdued by the Divine power, he was constrained to bless the people. The Lord put blessings into the mouth of that hireling, to the disappointment of the king.

Now being wrapt by the Spirit into the distant future, Balaam beholds the invincible power of the lion of the tribe of Judah! He beholds *a star coming forth from Jacob*, and a *sceptre rising out of Israel*; and this sceptre dashing Moab in pieces, and bringing destruction upon the restless and proud people.

Such prophecy, considering the seer who declared it, was the more calculated to impress the minds of Israel—to cheer them on their way by the bright prospect of a glorious era in their history.

And when we look back to the Hebrew theocracy, and consider the dealings of Jehovah with his ancient people, we must bear in mind the relation in which their history stands to the Gospel dispensation.

God's dealings with them were intended to be a foreshadowing of the dealings of *Jehovah-Jesus*[2] with his

[1] Numb. xxii. 1, *seq.*

[2] Compare the Hebrew אֶהְיֶה, "*I am*," by which name God revealed himself unto Moses (Exod. iii. 14), with ἐγώ εἰμι, "*I am*," by which Christ reveals himself to the Jews (John viii. 24).

Most commentators supply ἐκεῖνος. Bloomfield finds in it "an instance of our Lord's consummate modesty" (!). Others supply ὁ Χριστός, like John iv. 2; but the analogy is incorrect, as in chap. iv. 26 the predicate is justly supplied from the preceding context, whilst here no such predicate can be supplied, unless we make it synonymous with אֶהְיֶה or יְהוָה, *The self-existent.*

church through all ages: His church with whom he identifies himself, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us" (John xvii. 21): "That the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them" (ver. 26). The arrow directed against his church is aimed at Him who is the head.

Looking upon it from this point of view, we shall not read these portions of the Old Testament "as a tale that is told"—as a narrative in which we have no concern—but "as being written for our learning." The people of God will always continue to enjoy his presence and protection, "even to the end of the world;" whilst *Edom*, *Moab* and *Ammon* are constantly held up as the enemies of God, as the personifications of pride and idolatry. *The past thus becomes the mirror of the future.*

Numbers XXIV.

Ver. 16. These are the prophecies of Balaam,
The declaration of him who heareth the word of God
And knoweth the wisdom of the Most High.[1]
He sees the vision of the Almighty,
Falling down and having his eyes open.
17. I see him, but not now:
I behold him, but not nigh.
A star proceedeth from Jacob,
And a sceptre rises from Israel,
And smites the corners of Moab,
And destroyeth all the sons of tumult.

---

[1] Bal Hatturim: "He knoweth the wisdom of the Most High לְפִי שֶׁרָצָה לְגַלּוֹת יְמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ as he was about to reveal the days of the Messiah."

The pathetic annunciation of the seer; his falling down when he sees the vision; the use of the phrase בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, *in the latter days* (ver. 14), would at once lead us to expect a prediction of transcendant import. This is fully borne out by ver. 17.

I. Both Jewish and Christian expositors understand "*the Star*" to signify the *Messiah*.

a) The Targum Onkeles: כַּד יְקוּם מַלְכָּא מִיַּעֲקֹב וְיִתְרַבְּא מְשִׁיחָא מִישְׂרָאֵל, "when a king shall arise from Jacob and the anointed shall become great in Israel." Aben Ezra and Bal Hatturim: וְרַבִּים פֵּרְשׁוּהוּ עַל הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "and many explain it of Messiah." That this interpretation has been commonly accepted among the Jews is evident from the fact that, at the time of Hadrian (about 136 A.D.), the impostor who, under the pretence of his Messiah-ship, roused the Jews to rebel against the Romans, assumed the name of *Bar Kochab*, son of the star, from which the second Jewish war originated.

The history of this personage is given in the book Zemach David: בַּר כּוֹזִיבָא הַנִּקְרָא בַּר כּוֹכְבָא מָרַד בִּרוֹמִיִּים וְעָשָׂה אֶת עַצְמוֹ מָשִׁיחַ וְעַל כֵּן נִקְרָא בַּר כּוֹכְבָא מִפְּנֵי שֶׁדָּרַשׁ וְאָמַר שֶׁעָלָיו נֶאֱמַר דָּרַךְ כּוֹכָב מִיַּעֲקֹב, "*Bar Kuziba* (the son of lies), *called Bar Cuchiba* (the son of the star), rebelled against the Romans and gave himself out for Messiah. He was therefore called '*the Son of the Star*,' as he alleged that concerning him is it written '*a star shall proceed from Jacob*.'"

b) The New Testament is decisive in favour of referring this designation to Messiah:—

(1) Zecharias, who "was filled with the Holy Ghost and prophesied," called the child Jesus ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους, "the dawn from on high," Luke i. 78.

(2) He is also designated "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," John i. 9, and

(3) "Until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts," 2 Pet. i. 19.

(4) And to put the reference of our passage beyond any reasonable doubt, Christ himself says to John, at Patmos, "I am, ὁ ἀστὴρ ὁ λαμπρὸς ὁ πρωϊνός, the bright and morning star," Rev. xxii. 16.[1]

II. Calvin, Le Clerc, and others, refer this prophecy, in the first

[1] Strange that Hengstenberg should have overlooked such explicit New Testament declarations, and aver that "no evidence can be drawn from the New Testament. An appeal has been made to the star announcing the birth of the Redeemer, but these have nothing in common."—(Christology.)

instance, to David, but then himself and his temporal victories are regarded as typical of Christ and his spiritual triumphs which the prophet had clearly in view.

This is adopted by Hengstenberg, who says, "In itself considered, the supposition of an inferior reference to David, and a higher one to Christ, is liable to no objection. In this case, neither David nor Christ as an individual, but the royal race, who shall hereafter arise among the people of Israel, would have been represented to the prophet as personified."

It is, however, we think, liable to a serious objection. It introduces a vagueness, or—if we may use a favourite phrase of his own—a chimera, into a prediction which *Christ applies to himself*—"*I am the morning star!*"

It is true, indeed, that this prophecy is partly fulfilled in David, who destroyed the Moabites, the Idumeans, and the neighbouring enemies of the theocracy (2 Sam. viii. 2, 11, 12, 14); but the star of Jacob is to destroy כָּל בְּנֵי שֵׁת, all the sons of tumult, *i.e.*, all the tumultuous enemies of God (comp. Ps. ii.). שֵׁת is a contraction for שְׁאֵת, from שָׁאָה, as explained in Jer. xlviii. 45:—

> A fire went forth from Heshbon,
> And a flame from the midst of Sihon,
> And devoured the corner of Moab
> And the crown of the head of the tumultuous.

בְּנֵי עַוְלָה = בְּנֵי שָׁאוֹן, *οἱ υἱοι ὑπερήφανοι*, the proud enemies of God, of which Moab, Edom, and the other enemies of God's people are the representatives.

קַרְקַר, pilpel of קוּר, *to dig, undermine, outroot*. It was Moab who formed an alliance with the Midianites, which is, as it were, to build a fortress against the theocracy. It was Moab who sent for Balaam, he therefore predicts, first, the undermining and destruction of Moab, and then also the downfall of all the proud enemies of God, who shall vanish at the glorious appearing of the Star out of Jacob, and at the brightness of his rising![1]

---

[1] This prophecy is perhaps the origin of the following tradition of Pesikta Rabetha: מַלְבִּישׁ הַקב"ה לְמְשִׁיחַ צִדְקֵנוּ לְבוּשׁ שֶׁזִּיוּוֹ הוֹלֵךְ מִסּוֹף הָעוֹלָם וְעַד סוֹפוֹ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִשְׁתַּמְּשִׁין לְאוֹרוֹ וְאוֹמֵר אַשְׁרֵי שָׁעָה שֶׁבָּה נִבְרָא אַשְׁרֵי הַבֶּטֶן שֶׁמִּמֶּנּוּ יָצָא, "The holy and ever blessed God shall invest Messiah, who is our righteousness, with a robe whose splendour shall reach from one end of the world to the other, and Israel shall walk in his light and say, 'blessed be the hour in which he was born, blessed be the womb which conceived him.'"

A Prophet like unto Moses.

Deut. XVIII.

Ver. 15. A prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me, will the Lord thy God raise up unto thee; unto him ye shall hearken.

16. According to all thou didst desire from Jehovah thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of Jehovah my God, and this great fire I will not see, that I die not.

17. And the Lord said unto me, In this they have well spoken.

18. A prophet will I raise to them from their brethren, like unto thee, and I will put my word into his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.

In the preceding verses Moses warns the people against the soothsayers, and against all species of idolatrous witchcraft (ver. 9): "When thou hast come to the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations."

This he enforces by the following considerations: *first* (ver. 12), "For all they who do these things are an abomination unto the Lord, and because of these abominations the Lord thy God drives them out from before thee;" and moreover, *secondly*, "A Prophet[1] from the midst of thee will the Lord thy God raise up unto thee."

[1] The word נָבִיא, a "prophet," though the object is here put prominently for the sake of emphasis.

It is difficult to see the connexion of this with the preceding verse. It means, perhaps, "as if he had said, in you from whom the greatest of prophets, even the Mediator, is to rise, it would at once be strange and unbecoming to go to the false, abominable, heathen witchcraft;" or, this prophecy was suggested to Moses while speaking of the heathen oracles.

"Like unto Moses." None of the Jewish commentators find in this passage an allusion to Messiah. The regal splendour of their expected deliverer dazzles their vision, and casts into shade his priestly and prophetic offices.

Thus Aben Ezra refers it to Joshua, though Joshua never appeared in that capacity. Bal Hatturim and Jalkut Shimoni think that Jeremiah is here meant.[1]

I. It seems, however, to have been the current opinion of the Jewish and Samaritan nations at large, that Messiah is the subject of our prophecy.

a) "This is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?" and among other things, they asked him, "Art thou the Prophet?" ὁ προφήτης, viz., the one promised (John i. 19). Again, when they had seen the miracles that Jesus did, they said, "This is truly the prophet who should come into the world" (John vi. 14).

Further, after Jesus raised the widow's son at Nain, they said, "A great prophet has risen up among us" (Luke vii. 16): προφήτης μέγας ἐγήγερται is the complement of our prophecy, יָקוּם לְךָ.

That the Samaritans also thus understood this prediction, is evident from John iv. 25: "I know," says

[1] The name of Jeremiah is a great accommodation to expositors when they are at a loss to find out the subject of the discourse.

the woman of Samaria to our Lord, "that the Messiah comes (ἔρχεται), and when he has come he will tell us all things." Now, as the Samaritans received only the Pentateuch as canonical books, the idea which is here expressed of Messiah could have been derived from no other source than the passage under consideration.

This was the only legitimate conclusion which the people arrived at with respect to this prophecy.

It is also the only way to reconcile it to Deut. xxxiv. 10, where it is said, "And there arose no prophet like unto Moses whom the Lord knew face to face," viz., by referring it to the greatest of all prophets who was in the bosom of the Father, and who appeared amongst us in the capacity of a prophet to teach us by his word and Spirit; and the allusion to Horeb points to one who, like Moses, is the Mediator of the new covenant, even Jesus Christ, through whom we have free access unto the Father.[1]

b) The main force of the argument, however, rests upon the declaration of the New Testament, which is decisive:—

---

[1] The superiority of Moses to the rest of the prophets, says Maimonides, consists in the following particulars: א) בְּמשֶׁה יְדַבֵּר פֶּה אֶל פֶּה וְאִם שָׁאַר הַנְּבִיאִים עַל יְדֵי מַלְאָךְ: ב) מֹשֶׁה בָּאֲתָהוּ הַנְּבִיאָה וְהוּא עֵר וְשָׁאַר הַנְּבִיאִים בַּחֲלוֹם וּבְחָזוֹון לַיְלָה: ג) מֹשֶׁה בָּאֲתָהוּ הַנְּבִיאָה בְּלִי חֲרָדָה וְשָׁאַר הַנְּבִיאִים חֲרֵדִים בְּנְבִיאָתָם: ד) מֹשֶׁה הִתְנַבָּא בְּכָל עֵת שִׁירְצָה וְשָׁאַר הַנְּבִיאִים בְּעִתִּים מְיוּחָדִים. "(1.) With Moses God spake mouth to mouth, and with the other prophets through the ministry of an angel. (2.) To Moses the prophecy came when he was awake, but to the other prophets in a dream or night-vision. (3.) To Moses the prophecy came without producing perturbation, but the rest of the prophets were the subjects of agitation on account of their prophecy. (4.) Moses prophesied whenever he pleased, and the others only at stated times" (*More Nebochim*, II. 35). Compare Heb. iii. 2: "Who was, &c., as also Moses was faithful in all his house."

(1.) At the transfiguration, the voice out of the cloud said, "This is my beloved Son . . . hear ye him;" corresponding to אֵלָיו תִּשְׁמָעוּן in our passage.

(2.) Peter said to the Jews in the temple, "Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto Moses," Acts iii. 22.

II. Origen, Kimchi, Alshuch, and others, take נָבִיא as a collective noun, and understand the prophets of all periods, *i. e.*, the prophetic order.

Others, again, take נָבִיא indeed collectively, but regard the promise as completely fulfilled only in Christ; in whom the idea of the prophetic order was perfectly realized: so Calvin, Le Clerc, Dathe.

Both these views, however, are opposed to the terms of our prediction, which are in the singular, viz., כָּמֹנִי, *like myself;* כָּמוֹךָ, *like thyself;* and אוֹתוֹ תִּשְׁמָעוּן, *him ye shall hear.*

III. To obviate the difficulties connected with the last-mentioned exposition, Hengstenberg thinks that "the prophetical order appeared to Moses personified in Christ, in whom the idea of it was completely realized; there is thus a reference to the other prophets also, not as individuals, but in relation to that Spirit by which, though in an inferior degree, they were influenced and made one with their head. They were contemplated in Christ, because they were merely his organs: "His spirit gave them being."[1]

But this is too ingenious to accord with the characteristic simplicity of the Hebrew writers in general, and

[1] Christology.

with this oracle in particular. It looks very much like the method of what the Germans call *Hineinexegisiren*, *i. e.*, throwing a sense into the passage, instead of getting one out of it.

Let us, then, give up the idea of psychological and Hagadeistic trickery, and all species of mysticism, in expounding the oracles of God, and we shall see more light and beauty in the simplicity, both of thought and diction, in the Hebrew prophets, provided our tastes be not impaired by cravings after extravagant speculations.

Messianic Psalms.

Introduction.

The promise made to our first parents—immediately after their fall—of a Mediator who is to take away the tempter's triumph (Gen. iii. 15); the selection of Shem, from whose descendants salvation should come (Gen. ix. 26); the promise given to Abraham (Gen. xii. 3; xviii. 18; xxii. 18), and ratified to Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 4) and to Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 14), through whom it is further handed down to Judah (Gen. xlix. 15); the vision of Balaam (Num. xxiv. 17); and, lastly, the reference of Moses to a prophet and Mediator like himself (Deut. xviii. 18); these precious promises, like so many brilliant stars (which no wind of adversity could extinguish), were lighted up before the eyes of Israel.

As the bequest of their fathers and their deliverer, they were fondly cherished by the nation, who anxiously looked forward to the day of their accomplishment.

For, "to the Israelitish nation, prophecy was the interpreter of history; it gave them the intelligible notice of the approaching events, and supplied them with reasons of God's providence in bringing these events to pass."[1]

But about four centuries have elapsed, and the voice of prophecy seemed to have been hushed to silence. "The word of the Lord was precious in those days, there were no open visions" (1 Sam. iii. 1), until the Lord raised David, the sweet singer of Israel, to the

[1] Davison's Discourses on Prophecy, p. 231, 4th Ed.

throne of Judah, in whom prophecy makes some of its greatest revelations.

In David, the prediction of the prominence of Judah assumed an important reality. In his Psalms, we have an assemblage of the glorious attributes and perfections of the Messiah foreshown.

The general predictions given respecting "*the Seed of the woman*," the "*Peace-bringer*," "*the Star*," and "*the Mediator*," assume in these sweet songs a more definite, and, as it were, a more concrete form.

The Messiah is here personally introduced as the Son of God, the anointed King over Zion, to whom all nations shall be subject (Ps. ii.). He is to establish an everlasting kingdom of peace and justice (Ps. lxxii.), and as Priest after the order of Melchizedek, he is to ascend to the right hand of God, to rule in the midst of his enemies, who shall lie prostrate at his feet (Ps. xlv. and cx.)

He is also delineated as surrounded with afflictions, and enduring heavy sufferings, but his deliverance from the power of death has for its result the spread of the kingdom of God among all nations (Ps. xvi. and xxii.)

Hence the expressed hope and expectation "that all nations shall one day return unto the Lord, fear his name, and see his salvation, and be joined to the people of the God of Abraham, and shall praise and worship Jehovah" (Ps. xlvii. lxvii. lxviii. lxxvi. xcvi. xcvii. xcviii. cx., &c.)

The last words of David, as recorded in 2 Sam. xxiii. 1-6, which bear reference to these glorious predictions, show the light in which they were contemplated by himself, and may thus form an appropriate introduction to our subject:—

2 Samuel XXIII.

Ver. 1. These are the last words of David.
The saying of David the son of Jesse,
The saying of the hero who was raised high
As the anointed of the God of Jacob,
And the sweet Psalmist of Israel.
2. The Spirit of Jehovah spake by me
And his words were upon my tongue.
3. The God of Israel said,
The rock of Israel promised unto me
A ruler over (all) men—a righteous one,
Ruling in the fear of God.
4. And he (shall be) like the light of the morning
when the sun shines.
A morning, not of clouds, (when) from the
glittering rain
The grass springs from the earth.
5. For my house is not so with God,
But he hath made with me an everlasting
covenant,
Ordered in all things and sure.
6. Truly this is all my salvation and all my delight,
Will he not cause it to spring forth?

Scarcely any part of the Old Testament has been more grossly misinterpreted than the passage before us. From ver. 3-6, almost every clause has been differently twisted by each commentator. The excellent English version verges here on Hagadaistic paraphrase, and is by no means excelled by any of modern translations. We leave it to our readers to find a sense in either of them, if they are able.

It is true, indeed, that the whole poem is what Jarchi designates מִקְרָא קָצִיר, "short reading," *i. e.*, elliptical, and in several parts rather obscure; but the Messiah, who is the sublimest theme of

David's Psalms, to which this forms an epilogue, is here clearly and prominently set forth, which should not have been overlooked.[1]

The import and connexion of the whole is as follows:—

Ver. 2.—The Psalmist first announces the source of his composition. The strains of my sweet songs are not of my own composing, but they are the productions of the Spirit of God, who put these words into my mouth. It is the indwelling of his extraordinary influence as the immediate antecedent to their production.

Ver. 3.—As to the loftiest theme of my Psalms, viz., the king Messiah, it was the God of Israel, the rock of Jacob, who promised me a ruler over all men ruling in the fear of God.

אָמַר and דִּבֶּר denote both *to say* and *to promise* (see Deut. vi. 3; xix. 18; Jon. iii. 10). The noun אֵמֶר also, derived from this verb, has the same significations, viz., *saying* (Ps. xix. 4), and *promise* (Ps. lxxvii. 8). מוֹשֵׁל, "*ruler*," is the object, בָּאָדָם, *over all men*," like Ps. xxii. 28-32 and lxxii. 11, 17.

The appellation צַדִּיק, "*The righteous one*," is used of Messiah in Is. liii. 11, and מוֹשֵׁל יִרְאַת אֱלֹהִים, "*ruling in the fear of God*," is applied by the same prophet to the shoot from the stock of Jesse, viz., "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him . . . the spirit of the fear of God, and his delight shall be in the fear of Jehovah" (Is. xi. 2, 3).

Ver. 4.—He shall be like the light of the morning. "Christ is a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel" (Luke ii. 32).

מִנֹּגַהּ מִמָּטָר, "from the glittering rain," literally, from the light

---

[1] Pye Smith, after Kennicott, finds here not only a reference to Messiah the King, but also supposes that ver. 7 refers to a persecuted and crucified Saviour; but his version has the disadvantage of not being borne out by the Hebrew text, and of spoiling the antithesis in ver. 7. It reads as follows:—

1. The oracle of David the son of Jessai,
   Even the oracle of the high-raised hero,
   Anointed by the God of Jacob,
   And the delightful author of the songs of Israel.
2. The Spirit of God speaketh by me,
   And his word is upon my tongue.
3. The God of Israel saith,
   To me speaketh the God of Israel.
4. Ruling over man is a righteous one,
   Ruling in the fear of God:
   Even as the light of the morning shall he shine,
   Jehovah the Sun.
   A morning without cloud for brightness,
   [as] After rain the herbage from the earth.
5. Truly this is my house with God,
   For an everlasting covenant he has fixed with me.
6. But the wicked shall not grow
   As prickles, to be moved away all of them;
   For they cannot be taken by the hand.
7. And the man who shall touch them
   Will be filled with the iron and the shaft of the spear.

Scripture Testimony, 3rd. Ed., I., p. 262, *seq.*

from the rain, which we take for מִנִּגַּהּ מָטָר; one מ being pleonastic, as Lev. iv. 12, אֶל מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה, for אֶל חוּץ. The meaning we conceive to be: "not like the rainy morning, when the clouds darken the sun, and make his light uncertain, but like the bright unclouded morning, when the sun shines with serene and steady brilliancy."

Ver. 5.—"For my house is not so with God," that its dynasty should be tottering, and exposed to shifts and uncertainties; it rests upon a sure foundation, viz., upon the covenant made with the fathers and with Judah, from whose family I was chosen.[1]

The same view of our passage is taken by Kimchi: כִּי בוֹקֶר שֶׁהוּא עֲבוֹת וְעָנָן פַּעַם נִגַּהּ וּפַעַם מָטָר וְאֵינוֹ טוֹב אֶלָּא לְהַצְמִיחַ דֶּשֶׁא מִן הָאָרֶץ אֲבָל בֵּיתִי אֵינוֹ כֵּן אֶלָּא נִגַּהּ בְּכָל עֵת וּבְכָל זְמַן כִּי בְרִית עוֹלָם שָׂם לִי: "For a morning of mist and clouds, it now shines and now it rains, and is good only for the growth of grass from the earth. But my house is not so; it shines at all times and at all seasons, for he has made with me an everlasting covenant."

Ver. 6.—"Surely this is all my salvation and all my delight, that promises so bright and so glorious should be connected with my house; shall it not prosper, when God, דִּבֶּר לִי, promised it unto me?"

In addition to the fact that this epilogue has no sense unless we adopt its Messianic interpretation, we have also the authority of Jonathan's Targum, who renders ver. 1, וְאִלֵּין פִּתְגָמֵי דָוִד דְּאִתְנַבָּא לְסוֹף עָלְמָא לְיוֹמֵי מָשִׁיחָא דַּעֲתִידִין לְמֵיתֵי, "And these are the prophetic words of David, which he prophesied concerning the end of the world and the days of consolation which are to come;" and ver. 3, אָמַר לְמַנְאָה לִי מַלְכָּא דְּהוּא מְשִׁיחָא דְּעָתִיד דְּיָקִים וְיִשְׁלוֹט בְּדַחֲלְתָּא דְיָי, "he promised to appoint me a king, namely, Messiah, who is to rise and rule in the fear of God."

---

[1] See 1 Chron. xxxviii. 4, where David traces his election to the throne of Israel to the promise made to Judah: "For he hath chosen Judah to be the ruler, and of the house of Judah, the house of my father; and among the sons of my father he liked to make me king over all Israel."

"After such a definite historical testimony to the expectation of the Messiah by the ancient king, it appears to us, that the expositor of the Psalms, guided merely by a regard to historical verity, must proceed on the supposition, that among the many lyrical effusions of the royal Psalmist, some at least will be found in which this great hope is expressed."[1]

This historic testimony is fully sustained by the New Testament authority: when the Pharisees said that the Messiah was the son of David, our Lord asked them, "How then does David, ἐν πνεύματι, in spirit call him Lord?"[2] quoting the 110th Psalm. On the day of Pentecost, the apostle Peter, in his address to the assembled multitude, argues the resurrection of Christ from Psa. xvi: "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God hath sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ" (Acts ii. 29).

In considering, then, the Psalms on historical ground, on the one hand, and comparing them with the quotations in the New Testament, on the other, we find two kinds of Messianic references:—

I. Direct and exclusive Messianic-prophetic Psalms, namely, those in the exposition of which we are limited, either by their contents or by New Testament authority, to Christ as their exclusive object, and, to use the expression of Hieronymus, "Audacis est hos Psalmos interpretari velle, imo de eis aliud sentire;" and

II. Metaphrasis, *i. e.*, where the words of the Psalmist are only the substratum for the New Testament writers' own ideas.

[1] Tholuck, Old Testament in the New.

[2] Matt. xxii. 43.

Prophetic Psalms.

UNDER the direct and exclusive Messianic-prophetic Psalms we class the following: Psa. ii. xvi. xxii. xlv. lxxii. and cx.

They differ from the Messianic prophecies in respect of form only.[1] The prophets deliver their visions with the prefatory oracular נְאֻם יְהוָה, the word of Jehovah, &c., whilst the Psalmist delivers his prediction in the form of a lyrical poem, for the service of the temple, which was eminently calculated to inspire the Jewish mind, and keep alive in Israel the expectation of the promised salvation through the Messiah.

We now proceed to the consideration of the Messianic Psalms, namely, those which have a direct and exclusive reference, commencing with Psalm ii.

[1] This remark we would extend to all the Psalms; and the distinction made by Maimonides, Keil (5th Vol. of Häv. Intr., p. 102), Öhler (Prolegomena, p. 91 ff), between the prophets and the Hagiographa, as if consisting in the degree of inspiration; which theory has been embodied by Sack (Apologetik), in a sentence generally understood to mean, that the Hagiographa contain no new revelation, but are used by the Spirit for the elucidation of former prophecies, has, we think, been satisfactorily refuted by Hävernick (Intr. II., 67), and no one will adopt it who has paid the least attention to the prophetic Psalms.

The Son of God.

Psalm II.

This Psalm bears no title, or name of its author, but the fact of its being classed among the Psalms of David, and put in such a prominent place in the collection;[1] its resemblance to his acknowledged Psalms, especially to the 110th, and to 2 Sam. vii. 23;[2] and, moreover, the authority of the New Testament, Acts iv. 25, leaves no doubt that David was its author.

We may consider this Psalm as a sublime specimen of the poetic diction of the Hebrew prophets, who paint with vivid colours the vision in which they are wrapt by the spirit of inspiration.

It yields to none of the poetic writings of the Old Testament in sublimity of personification, unity, and progressive action. Its dramatic regularity is perfect.

Different persons are alternately introduced speaking and acting, without the change of person being indicated. It divides itself into four stanzas of three verses each:—

I. The poet describes the murmur and rage of many kings and nations, who are heard at a distance, as it were, plotting rebellion against Jehovah and against his anointed.

II. From thence he raises his eyes to heaven, where Jehovah is enthroned, who first smiles at their impotent

[1] In some Codd. this is considered as the first in order, and the preceding as an introduction to it. The Al Codex has in Acts xiii. 33: ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ πρώτῳ, which reading is preferred to the common τῷ δεύτερῳ by Erasmus, Bengel, and Griesbach.

[2] To which, see our exposition, *infra*.

rage, then he rebukes them, and their murmurs change into terror.

III. The anointed himself declares the Divine decree in relation to his claims, viz., that he is the Son of God, the rightful heir, and ruler over the whole earth.

IV. In conclusion, the Psalmist exhorts them to submission, with threatening of Divine wrath to the disobedient, and a benediction to believers.

Ver. 1. Why rage the nations
And the people contrive[a] vanity?
2. The kings of the earth rise,
And princes take counsel together,
Against Jehovah and against his Messiah:
3. "Let us burst their bands
And cast from us their cords!"
4. He, enthroned in heaven, laughs,
The Lord mocks at them.
5. Then he speaks to them in his wrath,
And in his anger he terrifies them.
6. Yet I have anointed my king
Over Zion my holy hill.
7. I will declare the decree:
Jehovah hath said unto me,
"Thou art my son,
This day[b] have I begotten thee.
8. Ask from me,
And I will give (thee) nations (for) thine inheritance,
And for thy possession the uttermost parts of the earth.

[a] or, *murmur.*

[b] or, *now.*

Ver. 9. Thou shalt rule[a] them with an iron sceptre;
As a potter's vessel thou shalt dash them in pieces."
10. And now kings bethink yourselves:[b]
Be admonished ye judges of the earth.
11. Serve the Lord with fear,
And tremble with awe.
12. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish on the way,
For yet a little, and his wrath will kindle.
Blessed are they trusting in him.

[a] or, *break.*

[b] or, *act wisely.*

Ver. 1.—The praise bestowed upon Homer—

> "*Semper ad eventum festinat, et in medias res auditorem rapit,*"

is due to our Psalmist. The writer introduces us at once into the very midst of the action. He hears the tumult, and asks לָמָּה, *why? to what end?* why should they attempt a rebellion which can only terminate in their own destruction? Rage, רָגְשׁוּ, is used of the stormy sea, and of popular concourse, and is expressive of the *din of the multitude.*

Homer compares the tumultuous concourse of the people to a swarm of bees:—

> ἐπεσσεύοντο δὲ λαοὶ
> Ἠΰτε ἔθνεα εἶσι μελισσάων ἀδινάων.—Il. ii. 87.

Aquila, ἐθορυβήθησαν, like "the noise of a horse." הָגָה, to meditate, contrive. Herder takes the verb in its primary signification "*to murmur:*" "*Was brausen sie leeren Schall?*" *why do they murmur empty sound?* and finds in it an exquisite *gnomon* pointing to the result of the contest.

The first verb, רָגַשׁ, is in the pret., contemplating the action from its commencement; and the second is the future of progressive action (see Gramm. § 227, b. ii.)

Ver. 2.—*Nations* and *peoples* are synonymous parallels; so, also,

kings and *princes*. אֶרֶץ, *of the earth*, *including* kings and nations of all times who are opposed to the kingdom of God. נוֹסְדוּ, niph. of יָסַד, *to set themselves*, *to make a stand against*, is synonymous with יִתְיַצְּבוּ. Jarchi, Ben Ezra, Mendelsohn, Herder, derive it from סוֹד, *secret*, as in Psa. xxxi. 14. It includes, perhaps, both ideas, *to plot secretly*.

Ver. 3.—נְנַתְּקָה and נַשְׁלִיכָה are in the exhortative form, come *let us tear*, *let us cast off*, &c. De Wette founds one of his objections to the Messianic application of this Psalm upon this verse, namely, "The Messiah is first to subdue the nations, and then bring them under his sway; but here, those who are already his subjects, rise up in rebellion against him. But where is the nation which, having received his religion, afterwards endeavoured to extirpate it?"

But he takes too narrow a view of the prophetic language. The Psalmist's prophetic vision extends further. He takes his standing point at the time when the religion of Christ is established, and thus speaks of him as having already appeared, and as being installed rightful king over all nations. They already belong to him *de jure*, and hence the exhortation to obedience and submission.

For the fulfilment of this prophecy, we must look not only to the heathen nations and kings, who say "*We will not have this man to reign over us*," Luke xix. 14, but also to all the abettors of the papal system, who, under the garb of Christianity, seek to extirpate the Gospel of Christ.

Mark the suffixes in מוֹסְרוֹתֵימוֹ, *their* bonds, and עֲבֹתֵימוֹ, *their* cords laid upon us by Jehovah and his Son.

Ver. 4.—יוֹשֵׁב, act. partc. "*the enthroned*" in the heavens laughs. This forms a contrast with the rage and tumult of the enemies.[1]

From laughter, he makes a transition to "*he mocks at them*;" and, lastly, *he speaks and terrifies them*.

Ver. 6.—נָסַכְתִּי is the same as מָשַׁחְתִּי, I have anointed. The Sept., as if the words of Messiah commenced here, render, *ἐγὼ δὲ κατεστάθην βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Σιὼν ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ*, "*but I have been installed by him king over Zion, his holy mountain.*" We should

---

[1] See a similar description by Horace:—

Prudens futuri temporis exitum
Caliginosa nocte premit Deus.
Ridetque, si mortalis ultra
Fas trepidat.—Carm., lib. iii. 29.

read accordingly, קָדְשׁוֹ . . . נְסַכְתִּי מַלְכוֹ, which has been adopted by the Vulgate and others. But it breaks the dramatic regularity as well as the connexion. We therefore think, with De Wette, that this translation very likely originated in false interpretation.

Ver. 7.—אֶל, *concerning* (Gen. xx. 2; Ps. lxix. 7). חֹק, *the decree*, is understood by Von Meyer to mean, "The new law of faith in the Son of God, which is the fundamental law of his kingdom."

הַיּוֹם יְלִדְתִּיךָ (לְ for לָ, as יְרִשְׁתֶּם, for רֵ, Deut. iv. 1), *I have this day begotten thee, i. e.*, I have this day manifested and declared thee to be my Son; agreeably to Rom. i. 4: *τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει*, efficaciously declared to be the Son of God.

We read in Emeh-habacha: הַמָּשִׁיחַ הַזֶּה יִהְיֶה בֵּן טוֹב לְאֵל עֶלְיוֹן שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר כִּי, This Messiah shall be the beloved Son of the Most High God, as it is said (Ps. ii. 7), &c.[1]

Ver. 8.—Here Christ's mediatorial office is prominently pointed out. As the Son of God, seated at his right hand, he is making intercession for mankind, and in virtue, and on account of what he had done and suffered, he was at his request to have the nations for his inheritance. Aben Ezra: מִנְהָג הָאָב לְהַנְחִיל אֶת הַבֵּן עַל בֵּן אָמַר כִּי, It is the custom of the father to give a patrimony to his son, therefore he says, "For thine inheritance."

אַפְסֵי, like קְצוֹת, never means "boundaries" (of Palestine), Heb. גְּבוּל, but *end* of the earth. It is to justify this claim that the Divine decree is here noticed. The limits of Messiah's kingdom are co-extensive with the ends of the earth, and throughout the length and breadth of that kingdom homage and submission to the Son of God is required.

Ver. 9.—תְּרֹעֵם, fut. kal. of רָעַע, with ם suffix, *to break;* Chaldee, תְּתַבְּרִנּוּן; Aben Ezra, תְּשַׁבְּרֵם; Jarchi, תְּרוֹצְצֵם. The Sept., *ποιμανεῖς*, and Syr., ܬܪܥܝܢ, thou shalt feed them (like a shepherd) or rule them. They would accordingly read תִּרְעֵם, from רָעָה; in which case, תְּנַפְּצֵם is no synonymous parallel, but a further development of the idea of *strict government, iron yoke.* It refers evidently to the second coming of our Lord.

The idea of his appearing as a destroyer to his enemies is in perfect keeping with other declarations of the Old and New Tes-

[1] Quoted by Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judent., II., 722.

tament; as, *e. g.*, "He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked" (Is. xi. 4; comp. Ps. lxxii. 4; cx. 6). The most striking parallel is found in Rev. ii. 27: "Hide us from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb."

Ver. 10.—תַּשְׂכִּילוּ, imper. hiph. of שָׂכַל, *to be wise*. Mendelsohn: *Bedenkt es wohl, consider it well*, or, *bethink yourself*. הִוָּסְרוּ is the imperat. niph. in its reflexive signification, to be instructed or to take admonition. Aben Ezra considers it as a play of words, forming a contrast to מוֹסְרוֹתֵימוֹ, "their cords," ver. 3, which they wanted to cast off.

Ver. 11.—גִּילוּ, Sept. *ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι*, to rejoice. We prefer Gesenius's translation: erbebt, tremble, like Hos. v. 10; Arab., وجل.

Ver. 12.—Kiss the Son, בַּר = בֵּן, as Prov. xxxi. 2, lest *he* be angry. We are not convinced by Hengstenberg's pleading that this pronoun, and the one in ver. 12, trust in *him*, relate to Messiah; they more naturally refer to Jehovah, against whom the rebellion was in the first instance plotted.

His difficulty in the "sudden change of the subject" will be removed, when we take בַּר as an abbreviation for בְּנוֹ, his son, corresponding to בְּנִי in ver. 7. Thus, "kiss his Son, lest he, viz., the father, be wrath;" and the harmony of the conclusion with its commencement, עַל יְהוָה (ver. 2), greatly enhances its beauty.

Ver. 12.—כִּמְעַט, soon (Ps. lxxxi. 15), corresponding to *Μικρόν*, "yet a little" (John xvi. 16).

The imagery of this Psalm is evidently taken from the incidents of David's own life.

When he ascended the throne, "the Philistines came up to war against him" (2 Sam. v. 17-20), and it is not unlikely that this Psalm had been composed on that very occasion.

We are the more induced to refer it to that period, when we remember the light in which David regarded his government and dynasty, namely, as being only a link in that golden chain which extends from Judah to

Messiah (1 Chron. xxxviii. 4; 2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 77); hence, such incidents in his own history might have been the occasion of bright revelations as regards his Son and Lord, against whom, also, rulers and nations will conspire to throw off their allegiance. We find the same idea expressed by Stier, with the only difference that he considers David as a typical personage of Christ.[1]

That David himself is not the subject of our Psalm, that, under מְשִׁיחוֹ, the promised Saviour of mankind is understood, is proved:—

I. From the testimony of tradition.

a) *The Jewish nation generally regarded this Psalm as a Messianic prediction.* Nathaniel saith to Christ, "Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel," John i. 49. The high priest also asked Jesus, "Art thou the Messiah, the Son of God?" Matt. xxv. 63, which appellation they could have derived from no other passage of the Old Testament than the seventh verse of our Psalm.

b) *The ancient Rabbinic expositors*, as Rabbi Sadjas Gaon, Rabbi Moses Hadarshan, consider this Psalm as Messianic; and, among the modern, Aben Ezra and Jarchi. The latter rabbi, indeed, abandoned this interpretation according to his own confession, לְתְשׁוּבַת הַמִּינִים, for the refutation of heretics, *i. e.*, to destroy the argument drawn from it by Christians, which, however, does not affect the case.[2]

---

[1] Es konnte dieser Moment in seinem Leben, dem Königlichen Propheten ein Anlass werden, zu neuer, tieferer Durchschauung des Vorbildes dass er selber war. (70 Auserlesene Psalmen.)

[2] לְתְשׁוּבַת הַמִּינִים is not found in present editions. It was, most likely, omitted because it was found rather too candid a confession; it has, however, been restored by Pocock, in his Miscel. ad Portam Mosis, p. 308, in an Erfurt MS.

II. The New Testament writers are in favour of a direct Messianic prediction:

a) In Acts xiii. 33, the Apostle Paul argues the resurrection of Christ from ver. 7: "As it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;" which argument has no validity unless we understand the reference as direct and exclusive. This is not a little strengthened by a subsequent part of the Apostle's argument, ver. 35-38, where he continues to prove the same from Psalm xvi.; from which it is evident that he puts both these Psalms, viz., ii. and xvi., in the same category, and applies to them the same principles of hermeneutics.

Now as the sixteenth Psalm is unquestionably directly and exclusively Messianic (see our exposition, *infra*), so also the second.

b) See also Heb. i. 5, "For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son?" &c.; Heb. v. 5, "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son," &c.

III. The internal evidences, or the language of the Psalm itself, excludes all possibility of referring it to David or to any other king.

a) The first thing striking in this Psalm, as being inapplicable to any earthly ruler, is (ver. 2) the close connexion existing between Jehovah and his anointed; so that, to oppose him, amounts to rebellion against Jehovah himself; whilst, on the other hand (ver. 11, 12), to "kiss the Son" is the parallel of "serving the Lord."

To this may be added the suffixes of מוֹסְרוֹתֵימוֹ and עֲבֹתֵימוֹ, "their cords, their bands" (ver. 3), which shows the same degree of authority attached to both; in other

words, a community of interest existing between the father and son.

The supposition that David thus speaks of himself is contrary to the genius of the Old Testament saints; and no parallel instance can be produced from the whole Book of Psalms.

What a contrast would it present, when compared, for instance, with Psalm iv. 3, "But know that Jehovah hath set apart the godly for his service: the Lord will hear when I call unto him;" or Psalm vi. 8, "Depart from me all ye workers of iniquity, for the Lord hath heard the voice of my weeping."

How, then, will Hofmann and De Wette make the same Psalmist exhibit so much pride and presumption? Such a hypothesis appears to us utterly incongruous.

b) Not less striking is the appellation used by Jehovah: בְּנִי אַתָּה, "thou art my Son;" which appellation, although separately considered, will not prove much in favour of the Messianic interpretation, as the same predicate is used of Israel, Exod. iv. 22, and of the antediluvian church (Gen. vi. 2); also of the leader of the theocracy, as well as of heathen rulers (Ps. lxxxii. 6); is yet of the utmost significance when considered in connexion with the following parallel: "I have this day יְלִדְתִּיךָ begotten thee," and with the exhortation נַשְּׁקוּ בַר, "kiss the Son" (ver. 12).

We rest our argument, therefore, that the Messiah, the Son of God alone, is here understood by the term בֵּן, upon *the emphatic repetition* of the appellation.

This evidence we think impregnable, even by Hofmann's objection, viz., "Why not take the same predicates in Deut. xxxii. 18 and in Jer. ii. 27 in the same

sense?"[1] For the instances referred to bear no analogy to the Psalm in question. In Deut. xxxviii. 18—

> "Of the rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful,
> And hast forgotten God that *formed* thee,"

the language is unmistakeably figurative. יָלַד, "begat," is explained by the synonymous parallel מְחוֹלְלֶךָ, "formed thee." In Jeremiah ii. 27, the prophet reproves the Jewish nation for their idolatrous practices:—

> "They say to a stock, Thou art my father,
> And to a stone, Thou hast begotten me."

Who can mistake its meaning, that the Prophet represents them as invoking the idol as if it was their *father*, *i. e.*, their *creator?*

Far otherwise is it here, where the phrase, "*Thou art my Son,*" is explained by the parallel, "*this day have I begotten* thee;" and again, "Kiss the Son, &c.," by which the Holy Spirit emphatically intimates that the Son of God, κατ' ἐξόχην is here understood.

For the question, whether a phrase is to be taken in a literal or a figurative sense, must be decided by the connexion in which the phrase occurs. Now, so far as language can make a thing plain, it speaks in favour of our version. For we cannot think of any case more strongly favoured by the connexion than the word under consideration. The Sonship of Messiah is so emphatically stated and reiterated, as if to guard against such expositions as advanced by neologian writers. To have added to the emphasis would have degenerated it into tautology.

c) The anointed King referred to (ver. 8) is to have for his inheritance all the ends of the earth. This can-

[1] Weissagung in Erfüllung, I., p. 160.

not be applied to David's conquests without violently changing the sublime to the extravagant.

The ingenious Hofmann, indeed, thinks that "this promise is not real, but ideal, like Mark ix. 23; 'Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed and be cast into the sea, and shall believe . . . he shall have whatsoever he says;' but the Apostles never removed mountains, but effected by the power of their faith only that which was requisite for the exercise of their office."

This point we would be tempted to concede to him, if this was the only declaration of the universal dominion of Messiah—if we had not such positive promises, which no ingenuity can evade nor sophistry expunge, as, *e. g.*, "He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth" (Ps. lxxii. 8).

The supposition, then, that David refers it to himself is utterly inadmissible, as it would change the most sublime prophetic ode into a piece of bombast, if not presumption.

Still less can this Psalm apply to Solomon, for in this case we are left even without a historic basis. We read of no rebellion against Solomon; on the contrary, that his reign was distinguished by constant and unbroken peace (1 Kings iv. 5; 1 Chron. xxii. 9).

The Messianic interpretation of our Psalm, in fact, is so apparent, that even those whom dogmatic views must have strongly biassed against it have been constrained to adopt such interpretation. Thus Aben Ezra: וְאִם עַל הַכָּשִׁיחַ הַדָּבָר יוֹתֵר בָּרוּר, "If we refer this (Psalm) to Messiah, the matter is clearer." Even Eichhorn says, "The fact cannot be denied, that if we suppose the

Psalm to relate to Messiah, every description retains its most natural meaning, every expression stands in its proper place, every word in a clear light."[1] Berthold, Rosenmüller (2nd ed.), Dathe, Hufnagel, Tholuck, are decided in its favour.

With such important and weighty testimony before us—the interpretation of the Jewish fathers; the authority of the New Testament, combined with the internal evidences of the Psalm itself, which admits of no other natural application—we are justified in saying that none who are not under a mental delusion will apply this Psalm to any other subject than Messiah the Son of God.

[1] Bibliothek der Bibl. Literatur, I., 534.

The Resurrection.

Psalm XVI.

The dramatic character of the poetic diction appears here more strikingly than in the Psalm we have last considered.

Whilst in the second Psalm the persons speaking change alternately without their names being indicated, here the whole poem is put into the mouth of Messiah, who is represented as a sufferer in approaching death.

He expresses his confidence in God (ver. 1) as the sole source and author of his bliss (ver. 2), as well as that of all the saints, in whom is all his delight (ver. 3). His abhorrence of the wicked and their worship (ver. 4); Jehovah being his support and the enlarger of his portion (ver. 5). He is well satisfied with the share fallen to his lot (ver. 6). He does not shrink from the most cruel sufferings awaiting him, for his hope and confidence repose in Jehovah, who will not abandon him even in hades, nor leave his body to undergo corruption, but will raise him to life and to the enjoyment of pleasures at his right hand for ever (ver. 7-11).

Michtam of David.

Ver. 1. Preserve me, O God, for in thee have I trusted.
2. Thou[a] hast said to Jehovah, Thou art my God,
My bliss! there is none besides thee.
3. To the saints that are in the earth

[a] sup. "*my soul.*"

And [to] the excellent, in whom is all my delight.

Ver. 4. They multiply their sorrows who hasten elsewhere.
I will not accept[a] their libations more [defiled] than blood,
Nor take their names upon my lips.

5. Jehovah is my allotted portion and my cup.
Thou enlargest my lot.

6. Lines are fallen to me in pleasant [places],
Yea, my heritage is pleasant to me.

7. I will bless Jehovah, who has [thus] counselled[b] concerning me;
Also at nights my reins prompt me.

8. I have set Jehovah before me always.
When [he is] at my right hand, I shall not waver.

9. Therefore does my heart rejoice, and my soul[c] exulteth.
Yea, my flesh also shall rest in safety.

10. For thou wilt not abandon me in Sheol,
Thou wilt not permit thy Holy-One to see corruption.

11. Thou wilt make me know the way of life;
Fulness of joy in thy presence;
Pleasures at thy right hand for ever.

[a] or, *pour.*

[b] *decreed.*

[c] lit. *honour.*

The title מִכְתָּם, *Michtam*, heading this Psalm, is explained by Aben Ezra, מְזֻמּוֹר נִכְבָּד כְּמוֹ בֶּתֶם טָהוֹר, "*a precious song, like refined*

gold." So Luther and Mendelsohn: "*Ein golden Kleinod.*" Clericus finds an analogy in χρυσοῦς ἐπεσι of Pythagoras. The LXX and Theodot., *στηλογραφία, public inscription;* and the Targum, גְּלִיפָא תְּרִיצָא, *tituli inscriptio.*[1]

It is most likely only another name for מִכְתָּב, "a writing," like Is. xxxviii. 9, used for private devotion; while the title מִזְמוֹר was given to those Psalms which were sung in the temple.[2]

Ver. 1.—O God! אֵל, expresses the attribute of power. Aben Ezra, גִּבּוֹר שֶׁתּוּכַל לְהוֹשִׁיעֵנִי, "thou mighty, who art able to save me." Aqu., *ἰσχυρέ.*

Ver. 2.—אָמַרְתְּ, "*thou hast said.*" All Rabbinic expositors supply "*my soul;*" so the Chaldee, מְלַלְתְּ אַנְתְּ נַפְשִׁי קֳדָם יְהוָה, which is no uncommon phrase in Hebrew (comp. Ps. xlii. 16; xliii. 5; Jer. iv. 19; Sam. iii. 24). The Sept. εἶπα, and Syr. ܐܡܪܬ = אָמַרְתִּי, "*I have said,*" which is, indeed, found in some Codd.

For אֲדֹנָי, read אֲדֹנָי, "*my God,*" agreeably to all versions, or else the clause is mere tautology.

I have said to Jehovah, Thou art my God. There is a charm in these two monosyllables: my God! They give wings to the soul to soar into the regions of sweet and solemn delight. But who can soar to the height, who can fathom the depth of their significance, when they proceed from the mouth of *Him*, who was in the beginning with God, and who was God?

Hence the same idea is further developed in the appellation טוֹבָתִי, "*my bliss,*" or *highest treasure* (like כּוֹסִי, my cup, ver. 5). But these endearing epithets are only used to prepare the way, as it were, for expressing the relation of Messiah to his church, viz., "*Thou art not only my highest treasure, but there is none besides thee to the*

---

[1] The striking fact, that the Chaldee renders this Psalm only גְּלִיפָא תְּרִיצָא, to the exclusion of the others (Ps. lvi.-lx.) bearing the same superscription, leads me to think that this rendering originated with the Jewish practice of having this Psalm, from ver. 8 *seq.*, facing them when saying their prayers in the synagogue; and it is not impossible that the *στηλογραφία* of the LXX in this Psalm is owing to the same circumstance, which title they transferred to the other Psalms for the sake of uniformity.

[2] Lee's derivation of מזמור from the Arab. زمر, iratus, s. cantavit, we prefer to that of the Rabbis', Bishop Lowth's, and Gesenius', who derive it from זָמַר, to cut, prune, "so called on account of its being divided into rhythmical numbers."

saints, קְדוֹשִׁים, ἅγιοι, in the earth, and to the excellent, towards whom is all my yearning desire;" in other words, *those whom I came down to save, and "call to be saints," they also have none besides thee.*

Messiah and his saints are thus bound up in the love and worship of God (comp. John xvii. 23 *seq.*)

In a philological point of view, our exposition is free from all objections, being the literal rendering of the Masoretic text. The only change it involves is the division of verses 2 and 3.[1]

עָלֶיךָ, besides thee, like Gen. xxxi. 50, לִקְדֹשִׁים, to the saints; the לְ being the dative of the possessor. וַאַדִּירֵי, and [to] the excellent; the לְ to be supplied from לִקְדֹשִׁים. It is sometimes omitted without being thus attached to the preceding member of the sentence, as 2 Sam. iv. 2, בֵּן for לְבֵן; Ruth i. 2, שְׁדֵי for לִשְׁדֵי. It is here the plural construct to כָּל חֶפְצִי בָם (the excellent of all), in whom is my delight, which is the appellation of the church of God, Is. lxii. 4:—

> No more shalt thou be called forsaken,
> Neither shall thy land be called desolate,
> But thou shalt be called, חֶפְצִי בָהּ, "my delight in her."

This, then, we consider to be the most natural and easy construction of these two verses. But as they have considerably taxed the ingenuity of expositors, and have called forth many emendations of the Masoretic text, we shall submit some of them to the consideration of our readers:—

I. The English version has improved upon the LXX: *τῶν αγαθῶν μου ου χρειαν ἐχεις*, "my good thou needest not," in rendering, "my goodness extendeth not unto thee, but to the saints, &c." This, with its unquestionable superiority to other versions, is still only a paraphrase, and makes, after all, neither sense nor proper connexion; and besides, עָלֶיךָ never denotes "*unto thee.*"

II. More objectionable is such an exposition as S. Jarchi's, *e. g.*, הַטּוֹבוֹת שֶׁאַתָּה עֹשֶׂה לִי לֹא עָלֶיךָ הֵמָּה לְגָמְלֵנִי, "*The goodness which thou art doing for me, thou art not indebted to reward me.*"

III. The Chaldee: בְּרַם טִיבָתִי לָא מִתְיְהִיבָא בַּר מִנָּךְ, "truly my goodness is not given (me) without thee." So Symm.: *ἀγαθόν μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνευ σοῦ*; and Syriac: ܘܛܒܬܝ ܠܝܬ ܐܠܐ ܡܢܟ, "and my goodness is from thee."

[1] This exposition is to some extent adopted by Mendelsohn: "Nichts ist über dich den Heiligen in diesem hande."

Ver. 3.—To the saints, &c. J. D. Michaelis, to suit the LXX, *τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν ἐθαυμάστωσε πάντα θελήματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς*, suggests[1] the following emendations:—

Instead of אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ הֵמָּה וַאַדִּרֵי כָּל חֶפְצִי בָם

Read אֲשֶׁר בְּאַרְצוֹ מֵהֲדִיר כָּל חֲפָצָיו בָּם

"To the saints in *his* land he *performs wonders*,[2] all *his* delights is in them." Herder, with greater plausibility and less violence to the text, reads[3] לִקְדֹשִׁים אֲשֶׁר בְּאַרְצוֹ הֵמָּה אַדִּירִי, "As to the saints which are in his land, they are my glory;" where וְ only is transposed.

Ver. 4.—יִרְבּוּ, "they multiply;" fut. for the present; being a proposition which will always hold good, as antecedent and consequence. עַצְּבוֹתָם, their trouble, from עֶצֶב; so the Sept., *ἀσθενεια αὐτῶν*; and Syr., ܟܠܘܗܝ; Mendelsohn, Stier, and De Wette. The Targum has צַלְמֵיהוֹן, their idols; Symm. *τὰ εἴδωλα αὐτων*; so Gesenius, Rosenm., and Ewald.

The last-mentioned critic renders אַחֵר מָהָרוּ, they purchase another; Gesen., accus. of the neuter = *aliorsum*, "*Eilen anders wohin*;" Symm., *εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἐτάχυναν*, as if אָחוֹר, is yet better than the Sept., *μέτα ταῦτα* = אַחֲרֵי כֵן, (Vulg.) postea.

בַּל אַסִּיךְ נְסָכֵיהֶם (Engl. version), "I shall not pour," as the hiphil has also the kal signification. Here, however, we take the hiphil in its declarative sense, "I shall not *declare*, *acknowledge*, or *accept*," which is favoured by the Targum: לָא אֲקַבֵּל בִּרְעָוָא נְסוֹכְהוֹן, "*I shall not accept with favour their libations.*" But even taking the verb in its kal signification, nothing can be objected against its Messianic reference, as our Saviour in his state of humiliation was actually tempted to idolatry (Matt. iv.)

The LXX have *οὐ μὴ συναγάγω τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν*, as if אַכְנִיס נִסְכֵיהֶם.

מִדָּם, more [defiled] than blood. The מ does not admit here of any other explanation than as the comparative degree, where the adjective is understood; as (according to Lowth) in מֵרֶחֶם, "*more*

[1] Michaelis Critisches Collegium, p. 85.

[2] How he makes מֵהֲדִיר denote to perform wonders, or how, indeed, it can mean anything, is more than we can say.

[3] Geist der Hebr. Poesie, I., p. 218.

[*copious*] *than the womb of the morning*" (Ps. cx. 3). The Hebrew phrase for libations of blood would be better expressed by דַּם נִסְכֵּיהֶם, or נִסְכֵּיהֶם דָּם.

"*I do not even take their names upon my lips*," *i.e.*, either (as Kimchi), שְׁמוֹת הָאֲנָשִׁים הָהֵם, "*the names of these men*," or of *their libations*, which is employed *species pro genere*, meaning all abominable practices, and false worship of every description. It does not refer exclusively to idolaters, but the קְדוֹשִׁים are contrasted with the wicked, though nominally belonging to the church of God; and the sense is, "*I detest the sacrifices of the wicked, which are displeasing to God.*"[1]

Ver. 5.—מְנָת, contr. for מְנָאת, gift. וְכוֹסִי, "*and my cup*," is a figure of speech expressing *reward* both in a good and in a bad sense, Ps. xi. 6.

תּוֹמִיךְ, fut. hiph. of יָמַךְ, ἅπαξ λεγομενων, *to extend, enlarge*; Arab., s. ومكّة. Gesen. and De Wette take it as an anomalous form of the active partc. for תֹּמֵךְ, (Engl. version) maintainest; to which Michaelis justly objects, for want of analogy, which want is not supplied by the adduced form of יוֹסִיף, Is. xxix. 14; for this itself is more likely the future (see Alex. *in loc.*) Ewald regards it as an abstract noun: "*Besitzthum*," *possession*; "*Thou art the possession fallen to me by lot.*" This ingenious version, however, is fraught with a philological inaccuracy (rather a strange slip of such an eminent grammarian, and stranger still that De Wette has nothing more than a sign (?) to put at the end of it), viz., if we make תּוֹמִיךְ a substantive, and predicate of the proposition, whose subject is the pronoun אַתָּה, then it must be placed after the subject, thus: תּוֹמִיךְ גּוֹרָלִי אַתָּה (see my Gramm. § 123, *b*).

We therefore derive it, with Jarchi, Schultens, and Michaelis, from יָמַךְ, to extend, enlarge; אַתָּה precedes the verb, to make it emphatic, viz., "*thou, even thou art the enlarger of my lot.*"

Ver. 6.—בַּנְּעִימִים, in pleasant; [Aben Ezra] supply מְקוֹמוֹת, places; the Sept., ἐν τοῖς κρατίστοις; so Böttch., jucunditas; Stier and Luther, auf's liblichste. שָׁפְרָה occurs only in the Chaldee, signifying "to please," Dan. ii. 24.

Ver. 7.—יָעַץ, *to counsel, decree* (Ps. lxii. 5; Is. xxxii. 7), with the

[1] See Hengstenberg's Christologie, transl. Keith, p. 128. Comp. Is. lxvi. 3: "He that offereth an oblation [with such a disposition] as if he offers *swine's blood*."

suffix נִי, *concerning me* (see Gramm., § 190), *i. e.*, he who has thus decreed concerning my mission and my ways. There is thus a regularity in the consecution of the thought. First the decree, then the assistance for carrying it into effect, and lastly the achievement of the ordained victory (Stier). לֵילוֹת, at nights, or in seasons of trouble, "my reins prompt me to carry out my mission," for

Ver. 8.—שִׁוִּיתִי, piel of שָׁוָה, *I have placed*; מִימִינִי [he being] *at my right hand.*

Ver. 9.—The confidences expressed in the preceding verses rises to exultation: Therefore does my heart rejoice, and my *soul* (literally, my *honour*) כְּבוֹדִי. Mos. Hacohen:[1] כְּבוֹדִי כְּמוֹ נַפְשִׁי וְרַבִּים כָּמוֹהוּ בַּסֵּפֶר תְּהִלּוֹת, "my *honour* signifies my *soul*, there are many instances in the Book of Psalms." The LXX: ἡ γλῶσσά μου, my tongue.

Ver. 10.—For thou wilt not leave *me* in Sheol; נֶפֶשׁ does not always denote *soul*, but frequently, also, *self*, as Ps. iii. 3, רַבִּים אֹמְרִים לְנַפְשִׁי, *many say to my* soul, *i. e.*, to *myself*; Gr. φιλον ἠτορ, his beloved soul = himself.

שְׁאוֹל, hades, is the name given to the grave, or to the general receptacle of the dead (German, das Todtenreich). It is distinguished from קֶבֶר, a (single) *grave* or *burial place*, קְבָרִים. The לְ is the dative of tarrying at a place, as לְמִצְפָּה, in Mizpah, Hos. v. 1; so לִשְׁאוֹל, in hades.[2]

Thou wilt not deliver thy Holy-One, like the קרי (marginal reading), חַסִידְךָ.

In favour of this reading, we have not only the marginal correction, punctuation, all the versions, as well as 156 Codd. of Kenn. and De Rossi, but also the expositions of the Apostles (Acts ii. 25), who could not thus have reasoned had it not been the accepted reading among the Jews.

לִרְאוֹת, *to see, or experience*, Ps. xxxiv. 13, לִרְאוֹת טוֹב, *to experience good (days)*.

שַׁחַת signifies both THE GRAVE, from שׁוּחַ, to bow down, and

---

[1] Quoted by Aben Ezra, on Gen. xlix.

[2] Nothing but determined opposition, irrespective of the means employed, can engender such objection as Hufnagel's (Diss. in Ps., p. 114), viz., "If the Messianic interpretation be the true one, instead of לְ, we would have בִּשְׁאוֹל." If עָזַב means to abandon, and ל *in* or *at* a place, who can dogmatize against the Messianic interpretation, "*To abandon in Sheol?*"

corruption, from שָׁחַת, TO CORRUPT; as Job xvii. 4, where it forms the parallel with רִמָּה, worms;[1] as, also, in the passage under consideration, which the LXX and the Apostles render διαφθορά́ν; Syr., ܫܘܚܬܐ. Michaelis, Stier, and all other orthodox expositors, follow this interpretation, to which we may add the important testimony of Mendelsohn: "Du lassest deinen Frommen nicht Verwesung schauen."

The expression אַף בְּשָׂרִי יִשְׁכֹּן לָבֶטַח, *my soul also shall rest in safety* (ver. 9), decides its reference to one who is contemplated as buried, and lying in שְׁאוֹל, Sheol.[2] These two lines—

> *"Thou wilt not abandon me in Sheol,*
> *Nor permit thy Holy-One to see corruption."*

We consider, with Eadie, as "synonymous parallels; the last hemistich echoing the sentiment of the former."[3] According to this interpretation, then, our Psalm will give neither sanction to, nor warrant the doctrine of *Popish purgatory*, and *intermediate state* of some Protestants; the latter of which Bishop Horsley (Sermon X.) takes as a legitimate deduction, viz., "If the soul of Christ was not *left* in hell (hades) at his resurrection (Ps. xvi. ver. 7), therefore it follows that the soul of Christ must have been in hades between his death and resurrection." (See, also, Horn *in loc.*)

This conclusion rests upon no better foundation than the assumption, that נֶפֶשׁ must here mean *soul*, which is sufficiently answered by our rendering, *me*, or *myself;* and the import of the passage is, "Thou wilt not permit my life to continue under the power of death until my body is decomposed."

Ver. 11.—The Saviour conquers death and hell, and rises vic-

---

[1] לָשַׁחַת קָרָאתִי אָבִי אַתָּה
אִמִּי וַאֲחוֹתִי לְרִמָּה—*Job* xvii. 14.

"Putridinem compello pater meus tu
Mater et sororem meam appellito teredinem."—*Schultens.*

"Nenn' ich den Moder meinen Vater
Meine Mutter u. Schwester d. Verwesung."—*Schlottman.*

[2] Notwithstanding Hengstenb.'s pleading to the contrary (Comm. on the Psalms), in which he always excels, we lay considerable weight upon this clause, and think his exposition rather an unfortunate piece of speculation. The examples he adduces from Ps. lxiii. 1 and lxxxiv. 2, that בָּשָׂר means the living body, is not to the point, and proves nothing in favour of his interpretation.

[3] See Eadie's Biblical Cyclopædia, s. v. Hell, where the subject is largely discussed.

torious, to the enjoyment of his accomplished work at the right hand of God.

אוֹרַח, way; Sept., ὁδους, ways; and Syr., ܐܘܪܚܐ, as if, אָרְחֲךָ, thy way.

"*The fulness of joy.*" In the anticipation of the work he rejoiced (שָׂמַח, ver. 9); but here, at the right hand of God, from whence he looks upon the קדֹשִׁים and אַדִּירִים as the travail of his soul, he feels fulness of joy, שִׂבַע שְׂמָחוֹת, "and is satisfied," Is. liii. 11.

From our exposition of this Psalm it will be seen, that we regard its Messianic import not only free from all objections urged by rationalistic commentators, but also as the most easy and natural.

The subject of our Psalm is represented as one who finds himself surrounded with dangers—his life being threatened—and yet he prays not for deliverance from that particular danger; his soul rises higher; he triumphs even over death itself, exclaiming, "Death, where is thy sting? grave, where is thy victory?"

Such a declaration itself, without additional proof, would at once lead us to think of *Him* who broke the bars of death, and rose victorious to be exalted at the right hand of the Majesty on High. Yet this is far from being *the only admissible* interpretation.

Without much violence, the version may be modified so as to apply to David, or to any devoted worshipper of Jehovah, in adversity, as is indeed done by Jewish commentators.

The proofs of its Messianic import, therefore, are drawn chiefly, if not exclusively, from external evidence, viz., from the authority of the New Testament writers.

But nowhere is this testimony more decided and complete than in the present instance; so that the Divine

authority of the inspired Apostles depends upon the Messianic character of the Psalm under consideration.

To the Christian, therefore, scarcely any doubt can remain as regards the theme of the same; as the Apostle Peter, after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, not only refers this Psalm to Christ, but argues his resurrection from ver. 9-11 *in such a manner as to exclude all other references*:—[1]

"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he was both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day; therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins," &c., Acts ii. 25. Paul, also, reasons to the same effect, Acts xiii. 35-38. Now, if there be any validity in this argument, it is equally conclusive against its application to David only, as against the hypothesis, that it relates to David in a secondary, and to Messiah in a primary sense. Such a hypothesis is diametrically opposed to the exegesis of the Apostles, who deny its application to David in any sense, but regard it as a direct Messianic prediction: "*Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath,*" &c.

Michaelis (Crit. Colleg.) has justly remarked, "If what Le Clerk and others allege respecting the literal sense of the Psalm be correct, Peter would have deserved to be told, 'With all thine apparent candour, thou art a deceiver, seeking to delude the ignorant multitude. Thou pretendest that the Psalm speaks of the resurrection of Christ, and is not capable of any other inter-

---

[1] De persona vix dubium superesse potest inter Christianos, cum Petrus Act. ii. ultimos versus non tantum ad Christum applicet, sed et ex iis resurrectionem demonstrat. Similliter instituit Paulus Act. xii. 35.—*Venema.*

pretation, whereas it relates, if literally understood, merely to a deliverance from great danger of this life, to which David its author was more than once exposed.'"

It must be conceded that this Psalm, like most prophetic declarations, is best read in the light of its fulfilment, and that, previous to the exposition of the Apostles, the Jews referred it to David. But after the light has appeared, and the exposition of the Apostles so explicitly given, no enlightened commentator will conjure up any theory of his own, nor will any sober-minded intepreter prefer being blindfolded, groping in the dark in search of some other subject, than *Him* who is "*the resurrection of the dead.*" Yet, although the full import of this Michtam could not be known to the Jews before the resurrection of Christ, it was not entirely a sealed book to them. They could learn one very important truth, which is the groundwork of this Psalm, viz., that the spiritual worship of Jehovah leads the righteous beyond the grave.

They could see the dawn, though not the meridian brightness of this glorious prophecy, even *Him* who was to conquer death and the grave, and "bring life and immortality unto light."

Ernesti's excellent rule for the interpretation of prophecy is particularly applicable here, viz., "The pure and Divine mind purposing to signify beforehand anything future, did not fling forward the prediction in plain terms; but, mingling the knowledge of the future with things present, it embellished the prophecy in such a manner that even the hearers who then lived reaped some utility, and posterity acquired an accurate knowledge of the events after their completion."[1]

[1] Davidson's Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 149.

The Crucifixion.

Psalm XXII.

This Psalm is closely allied to the preceding (Ps. xvi.), both in respect of its subject-matter and form.

As in the sixteenth Psalm, so here, the Messiah is introduced speaking. His sufferings, intimated in the former, are here more particularly specified, and we obtain a deeper insight into their nature; they are, namely, his being abandoned by God, and delivered to the fury of his enemies (ver. 1-23). The triumph over death, in the former, is here delineated as a bright prospect of his deliverance, and the world-wide blessings that are to flow from it, viz., the rise and spread of his kingdom, even to the uttermost parts of the earth, embracing the whole human family, as the reward of his sufferings (ver. 23-33).

Ver. 1. To the chief musician on the hind of the dawn,
A Psalm of David.
2. My God, my God! why hast thou forsaken me?
(Why) so far from my deliverance, (and from) the words of my cry?
3. My God, I call by day, but thou wilt not answer,
And by night—but I have no rest.[a]
4. And yet thou art the Holy One,
Enthroned amidst the praises of Israel!

[a] or, *silence*

Ver. 5. In thee our fathers trusted;
They trusted, and thou savedst them.
6. To thee they cried and were delivered;
In thee they trusted, and were not ashamed.
7. But I am a worm, and no man;
A reproach of men, and despised of the people.
8. All that see me mock at me:
They pout with their lips—they shake their head:
9. "Trust in Jehovah! he will deliver him;
He will save him, for he delights in him!"
10. Yes, thou didst draw me from the womb,
My trust upon my mother's breast.
11. Upon thee was I cast from the womb,
From my mother's lap thou art my God.
12. Be not far from me! for distress is near—
For there is no helper.
13. Many bulls have compassed me;
Strong (bulls) of Bashan have surrounded me.
14. They gaped upon me their mouth,
A lion tearing and roaring.
15. I am poured out like water,
And all my bones are loosened;
My heart has become like wax melted in my bosom.

Ver. 16. My strength is dried up like a potsherd;
My tongue cleaveth to my jaws;
And thou wilt reduce me to the dust of death.[a]

17. For dogs have encompassed me;
A rabble of evil-doers have inclosed me;
They have beset[b] my hands and feet.

18. I number all my bones:
They look—they stare at me.

19. They part my garments among them,
And upon my vesture they cast lots.

20. But thou, O Jehovah, be not far:
My strength! hasten to my assistance

21. Free my soul from the sword;
From the power[c] of the dog, my lonely one.

22. Save me from the mouth of the lion;
From the horns of the unicorn[d] thou hast heard me.

23. I will declare thy name to my brethren.
In the midst of the assembly I will praise thee.

24. Ye adorers of Jehovah, praise him!
All ye seed of Jacob, honour him!
And fear him, all the seed of Israel.

25. For he has not despised nor abhorred the cry[e] of the afflicted,
Neither has he hid his face from him,
But when he cried to him, he heard.

26. Of thee (shall be) my song of praise in the great congregation.
My vows I will pay before his adorers.

[a] i.e., *the grave.*
[b] or, *like a lion.*
[c] lit. *hand.*
[d] or, *buffalo.*
[e] or, *affliction.*

Ver. 27. The meek shall eat and be satisfied:
They that seek the Lord shall praise him;
Their[a] soul shall live for ever.
28. They shall remember and return to Jehovah, all ends of the earth,
And all families of the nations shall bow down before him.
29. For Jehovah's is the kingdom,
And he is ruler among the nations.
30. They have eaten and worshipped all the prosperous[b] of the earth.
Before him shall kneel down all the bowed down to the dust,
And he who cannot keep himself alive.
31. Posterity shall serve him;
It shall be told of the Lord to future generations.
32. They shall come and declare his righteousness
To a people yet to be born, that he has accomplished it.

[a] or, *your*.

[b] lit. *fat ones*.

Ver. 1.—לַמְנַצֵּחַ; Aben Ezra, שַׂר עַל הַמְנַגְּנִים, the chief (or leader) of the musicians, which explanation is now generally adopted. The other part of the title, עַל עַיֶּלֶת הַשַּׁחַר, has given rise to many conjectures; literally translated, it means "*upon the hind of the dawn.*" Jarchi and Kimchi make it to stand for the Jewish people in exile (Cant. viii. 14). Luther and other Christian expositors think it descriptive of Christ in his sufferings, who is hunted like a hind in the morning, &c.; and Hengstenberg, "*suffering innocence.*"[1]

We are not relieved from a feeling of awkwardness connected with

[1] See our remarks, *infra*.

this exposition by being reminded by the latter that "this Psalm abounds in figures drawn from the animal kingdom." The LXX render ὑπέρ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως της ἑωθυνης, and Vulg., pro susceptione matutina; thus making אַיֶּלֶת synonymous with אֱיָלוּת, *strength*, ver. 20.

The Targum, עַל תְּקוֹף קוּרְבָּן תְּדִירָא, "*to the power of the morning sacrifice*, i. e., *morning Psalm*." Very similar is the opinion of some who render עַיֶּלֶת the morning-son, called by the Arabians *gazelle*.

According to Mendelsohn and others, it is the name of an instrument, "Morgenflöte." It most likely indicates only the name of some poem to the tune of which this Psalm is to be sung, without any reference to its subject, like Ps. lvi. 1; lvii. 1; Deut. ix. 26. So Aben Ezra, Gesen., Stier, Rosenm., Eichhorn.

מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד. The title, further, names David as the author; and even De Wette is constrained to acknowledge, that nothing decisive can be urged against it. Ewald, resting upon the gratuitous and false assumption, "that David could have had no anticipation of the conversion of all nations to the God of Israel, as expressed in this Psalm, is disposed to refer it to the time of the exile, the poet being persecuted by blood-thirsty Jews, but more especially by Gentiles," yet acknowledges that "he can find no further trace of its author."[1] This hint, however, has been improved upon by Hitzig, Vaihinger, Köster, and Lengerke, who succeed in finding out Jeremiah as the author.[2] But as their allegation of the "somewhat copious and flowing style of Jeremiah being peculiar to this Psalm" is not supported by any shadow of evidence, it may be dismissed as a bare assumption, that will not stand a moment's examination.

Ver. 2.—אֵלִי אֵלִי, *my God, my God!* (comp. Ps. xvi. 1), לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי, *why hast thou forsaken me?* These words were, according to Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34, uttered by our Saviour on the cross in Syro-Chaldaic, Ἠλί Ἠλί λαμὰ σαβαχθανί, which was the dialect then prevalent in Judea, and no doubt used by our Lord.[3]

---

[1] "Genauer will es jetzt nicht gelingen dem Dichter auf die Spur zu kommen."

[2] Notwithstanding Jeremiah's authorship (?) Lengerke, in his Commentary, with glaring incongruity, thinks the "ideal righteous"—and not Jeremiah—to be the subject of the Psalm (!) without even acknowledging Hengstenberg as the owner of this hypothesis.—Keil, vol. V. of Häv. Intr.

[3] The Chaldee of the Targums is אֵלִי אֵלִי מְטוּל מַה שְׁבַקְתָּנִי, and the Syr., ܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܗܝ ܠܡܢܐ ܫܒܩܬܢܝ

These words do not express impatience, faintheartedness, as some have imagined, neither do they imply anything unbecoming the character of our Lord; on the contrary, they appear to us as a most seasonable testimony of his Messiahship, and as appropriate to the occasion when they were uttered.

He was delivered to endure the agonies of death for his pretence to be the promised Saviour, the Son of God; and now, even upon the cross, when the world was seemingly about to close upon him, laden as he was with pain and anguish, amidst the taunts of an insulting rabble, he not only maintains his rightful claims, calling God "*his God*," in the true and proper sense of the term—his father with whom he was in the beginning—but also pleads with him, "Why hast thou forsaken me?"

"A sinful man," says Stier, may ask עַד מָתַי, "*how long, O Lord?*" or he may even use this expression (as Ps. x. 1; xlii. 10), only under certain conditions and limitations, viz., when resting upon God's promise and covenant; but the Holy-One, the Son of God, alone can plead with his father, "Why hast thou forsaken me?"[1]

Thus the words in question, when used by our Lord, were not only calculated to intimate to his disciples that the prediction of this Psalm was now accomplished, but served at the same time to refute the charge of blasphemy brought against him, "in that he called himself the Son of God." And in this Psalm there is a power and transcendant sublimity in the exclamation. It raises the question, only to be answered in a subsequent part of the poem, viz., the Messiah asks, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" and the reply is (ver. 27 *seq.*), "For the salvation of the ransomed church to be gathered in from the uttermost parts of the earth."

The complaint continues as follows: לָמָּה רָחַקְתָּ = רָחוֹק מִישׁוּעָתִי, *why art thou far from my deliverance*, דִּבְרֵי שַׁאֲגָתִי (and from) *the words of my cry?* for וּמִדִּבְרֵי, as Jarchi supposes, or as Kimchi ingeniously supplies כְּשֶׁתִּשְׁמַע, *when thou hearest the words of*, &c.

Luther, following the LXX, *μακράν ἀπο τ' σωτηριας μου οἱ λογοι*; Vulg., longe a salute mea verba, &c., construes "Fern von meiner Hülfe sind die Worte meines Flehens," far from my help are the words of my supplication; in which case, רָחוֹק is either taken adverbialiter, or as anallage numeri for רְחוֹקִים. But the following

[1] Siebzieg anserwählbe Psalmen.

prayer, אַל תִּרְחַק, ver. 11 and 20, favours the repetition of the complaint as given by the English version.

שַׁאֲגָתִי, from שְׁאָגָה, *the roaring of a lion*, also the groaning caused by the pressure of mental anguish. The Sept., *οἱ λογοι τῶν παραπτωμάτον μου*; Syr., ; Vulg., verba delecturum meorum; as if שְׁגִיאָה. This thought is amplified in the following ver.

Ver. 3.—My God, אֶקְרָא יוֹמָם, *I call by day, &c., and by night, and I have no rest*; דְּמִיָּה, from דָּמַם, to *be silent*, to *have rest*. As the parallel of עָנָה, it stands in the relation of antecedent and consequence:—

Thou dost not answer me, hence
I have no rest.

Some take the word in its primary signification, like the English version, "I am not silent," but then the sense is incomplete. יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה is like מִיּוֹם אֶל יוֹם, *from day to day*, i. e., *constantly*; in other words, "I cry to thee for help all the day long, yea, even the night finds me wrestling with thee still."[1]

Many Christian expositors think that the day specifies the day of Christ's crucifixion, and the night refers to the scene in the garden of Gethsemane. We are, however, not disposed to search after such minute and specific allusions.

Ver. 4.—And yet thou art the Holy One, יוֹשֵׁב תְּהִלּוֹת, *inhabiting*, or *enthroned amidst the praises of Israel*. This sublime image is purely theocratic, referring to the temple where Jehovah is represented as יוֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוּבִים, *the enthroned amidst the cherubim* upon the ark of the covenant (see 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2). The Sept., *ἐν ἁγιω κατοικεὶς ὁ ἐπαινος τον Ισρ.*

Ver. 5-7.—The Messiah is made lower even than the godly people in Israel, whose prayers and cries were heard, "But I am a worm,"

---

[1] Those who, like Hufnagel and Schulze, object to the Messianic character of this Psalm, as "These lamentations are inapplicable to Christ, who did not pray for deliverance from the hands of his enemies, but considered his death a part of his plan," should bear in mind that they speak of a Christ of their own imaginings, and not of the historic Christ revealed in the New Testament, who prayed on the cross the very words of this Psalm (ver. 1); and again, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," and "My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death." We know also who wrote concerning him that, "in the days of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears," &c., Heb. v. 7.

תוֹלַעַת, an image of contempt (Job xxv. 6),[1] וְלֹא אִישׁ, "*and no man*," corresponding to the description of Isaiah (liii. 3), נִבְזֶה וַחֲדַל אִישִׁים, "*a despised one and rejected* of men." חֶרְפַּת, an abstract noun in the construct, and בזוי, partc. passive construct, like גְּאוּלֵי יְהוָה, *the redeemed of Jehovah.*

Ver. 8.—יַפְטִירוּ is not like the Sept., ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, but, *pout, open;* hiatum faciunt cum labio. The progress of the description is thus natural; they first pout with their lips—shake their heads—as expressions of contempt or malicious joy, and then they are understood saying thus:

Ver. 9.—*Trust in Jehovah! He will deliver him!* גל, cast thy fortune and destiny. It neither means (as Gesen.), "let him trust," the third pers. imperat., which does not exist in Hebrew, but is always expressed by the future; nor (as De Wette) the inf. instead of the finite verb, like קַב (Deut. xxiii. 25); nor (as Ewald) the imperfect, which would be a strange anomaly; but simply, as Lee takes it, "the second pers. imperative." The meaning is: they say to the sufferer, "Trust thou in the Lord!" (on whom thou callest), and then they say to themselves (aside), ironically, "he will certainly deliver him!" The sudden change of person is well adapted to the language of bitter irony

The Jews unknowingly fulfilled this saying. Their language (Matt. xxvii. 42, 43) is but a slight modification of the language used by the Psalmist; πέποιθεν for ἤλπισεν, and εἰ θέλει αὐτὸν for ὅτι θέλει αὐτὸν.

Ver. 10.—כִּי, yes, truly, thou art, גֹּחִי, my breaker, partc. with suffix, from גחה, transitive verb (Mich. iv. 10), to break forth a child from the womb (comp. גּוֹזִי, Ps. lxxi. 6); Chaldee, אַפֵּקְתָּנִי, thou hast drawn me.

מַבְטִיחִי, partc. hiph., thou causest me to be secure, or kept me safe.

Ver. 11.—Hence thou art the object of my trust, הָשְׁלַכְתִּי, hoph., not as Gesen., I have cast myself, "but I have been committed" to thy care and protection, thou hast acknowledged me as thy son, and upon the ground of this relation rests my plea.

---

[1] When we remember the part which the serpent took in the history of the fall, we may perhaps find in תוֹלַעַת an allusion to Him who took the curse upon himself.—(Stier).

Ver. 12.—אַל תִּרְחַק, *be not far*, for צָרָה קְרוֹבָה, *distress is near*. "*Far*" is not put in opposition to actual contact, but to רָחֹק, *distance* (Aben Ezra). The description of this Psalm is not limited to the indignities endured by our Saviour in his last days upon the earth, but the humiliation and sufferings of Christ collectively, were concentrated before the prophetic vision of the Psalmist: they all pass rapidly before him, but Golgotha is the principal object of his vision, where the fire of God's anger devours the Holy One—the son of his love.

Ver. 13-15.—The attitude of his enemies is then vividly depicted: כִּתְּרוּנִי, they *have surrounded* me. The verb is used in a hostile sense (like Judg. xx. 43), like פָּרִים, bulls, and אַבִּירֵי בָשָׁן, *gigantic*. They gape with their mouth, whilst the sufferer,

Ver. 18.—"Is poured out like water." This phrase expresses the highest degree of death-agony (Lam. ii. 11); an analogous expression is used of our Saviour in Is. liii. 12: הֶעֱרָה לַמָּוֶת נַפְשׁוֹ, "*he poured his soul out unto death.*"

Ver. 17-19.—The Psalmist takes us back to the appalling scene—Golgotha is before us—we see the rabble surrounding the Holy One—they stare—they feast their eyes with malicious joy, upon his agonies; whilst he numbers all his limbs with a dread anticipation of their being about to become a prey to these bloodthirsty hounds—and they divide his garments among them, and cast lots upon his vesture.

There are differences of opinion with respect to the interpretation of the word כָּאֲרִי. A great deal has been written to fix the reading and interpretation of this word.[1]

---

[1] There are three readings, viz., כָּאֲרִי, כָּאֲרוּ, and כָּרוּ:—

1. כָּאֲרוּ is found in 93 of Kennicott and 337 De Rossi; in the Complutensian Bible; in the Basil Psalter, 1516. It is also certain that it was found in two genuine Jewish Codd., both from the great Masora on Num. xxix., and from Jacob Bemchaim's statement in Masora finalis of Bamberg's Bible: "In some most accurate books I have found written כָּאֲרוּ, and in the margin כָּאֲרִי." Aquila followed the same reading in translating it ἠσχυναν; the LXX, ὤρυξάν. The Syr. Vulgate, all ancient versions, in short, except the Chaldee, נָכְתִּין הֵיךְ כַּאֲרְיָא, had either כָּאֲרוּ or כָּרוּ.

2. כָּרוּ is found only in Christian copies, yet De Rossi and Rosenm. take this as the genuine reading, of which the others are only modifications.

3. כָּאֲרִי has the weight of all, except two MS., on its side. [Thus

As we have not followed either of the existing versions, but ventured a new conjecture of our own, we shall, in the first place, seek to vindicate our hypothesis.

I. We adopt the reading כָּאֲרוּ, which we render, they have "BESET," from the Arabic كَأَرَ, ex insidiis et occulto *circumvenit praedam* (Freitag.), and the parallel is thus complete: what the preceding verbs סְבָבוּנִי and הִקִּפוּנִי state generically, כָּאֲרוּ expresses specifically:—

Dogs have encompassed me;
A rabble of evil-doers have enclosed me;
They have beset my hands and feet.

Whilst the parallel is thus made easy and natural, it is in the main less objectionable than the other versions which we shall mention in the sequel. It deviates from the Masoretic text only by the change of י into ו, which might easily be mistaken for each other.[1]

II. Next to our rendering, we would give the decided preference to the reading כָּאֲרִי, in the nominative, "like a lion;" and the sense would be, They have surrounded my hands and feet with the fierceness of a lion. The verb is to be supplied from the preceding clause. The figure is descriptive of the dread of the victim to stir even his hand or foot when facing the lion, for as soon as he dares to stir the animal falls upon him.

Some take it in the accusative, "as they would surround a lion," which is less adapted to the sufferer, who first compares himself to a "worm" (ver. 7). It is also preferable to the Chaldee, נָכְתִּין הֵידִי כְּאַרְיָא, mordentes sicut leo. It is, moreover, supported by all Jewish commentators, Gesen., De Wette (last ed. on the Psalms). Hengstenberg, also, who in his Christology started a host of objections to כָּאֲרִי, and maintained that כָּאֲרוּ (they pierced) must be

---

Thus, the MSS. have all, with two exceptions, כָּאֲרִי; and all the versions, with the exception of the Chaldee, are in favour of כָּאֲרוּ; whilst כָּרוּ has not a single primary MS. There are also some MSS. that read כָּאֲרֵי, fodientes, as if it were the part. of the verb, as 148 Kenn. and 368 De Rossi. We have only to notice, in addition, that the Masora parva remarks that כָּאֲרִי, in this place, has another meaning than in Is. xxxviii. 13. See Davidson's Treatise on Bibl. Crit., vol. i., p. 404 *seq.*

[1] "This conjecture," says Dr. Davidson, "appears to me very probable, and perhaps better than that of Stuart." (In a letter to the Author.)

the correct reading, gave up his view (in his Commentary on the Psalms), and thinks that "כָּאֲרִי is the true one; and it would be to abandon everything like *certainty* in criticism, and, along with it, criticism itself, were we to substitute instead of it, with Ewald, כָּאֲרוּ."

This positive assertion is scarcely to be wondered at, as all the reasons urged by Hengs. formerly in the same dogmatic strain against כָּאֲרִי, which he now adopts, are of no moment.

III. Others prefer the reading כָּרוּ = scriptio plena, for כָּאֲרוּ, from the verb כור; Arabic, كَارَ for كَوَرَ, valide construxit, colligavit, "they have bound my hands and feet:" thus Rosenm., Ewald, Winer. De Wette, who in a former edition (Psalms) adopted it, relinquished it in his last edition, "for want of philological support; the Arabic being rather doubtful."

Jahn gives to the verb כור the meaning, "they have stained with blood," after Aquila, ἤσχυναν.

IV. The majority of Christian expositors make the verb כור synonymous with כָּרָה, "to dig," hence pierce; the permutation of the verbs ע״ע and ל״ה class being very common, as דום and דָּמָה, to be silent; בוז and בָּזָה, to despise. It has, also, the support of the Sept., ὤρυξαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας μου; and Syr., ܚܦܪ, transfixerunt. The Arabic كَارَ, "to dig," is also sometimes synonymous with طعن, "to bore through."

But this interpretation, which has been defended at great length by the late Prof. Stuart,[1] as if the whole Messianic character of this Psalm depended upon the issue, is liable to the following objections:—

a) The verb כור, or כָּרָה, never signifies to pierce through, but always "*to dig*" (a well or the like),[2] and is never synonymous with נָקַר or דָּקַר (Zech. xii. 10).

b) The MSS. are, at all events, in favour of א being inserted; there would thus be an additional anomaly in connexion with this

---

[1] In his last paper on Hebrew Criticism in the American Bibliotheca Sacra for Jan. 1852.

[2] Once only it occurs with reference to the human body, אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ, Ps. xl. See our exposition *in loc.*

reading, besides the other difficulties attending it. Dr. Davidson justly characterizes it as one-sided.[1]

Meanwhile, when we see that כָּרוּ has been adopted by Noys, who translates it, "They have pierced my hands and my feet,"[2]—who cannot for a moment be thought biassed in favour of orthodoxy—it is unreasonable to dogmatize on either side of the question: for when the reading is doubtful, and the evidences on both sides so equally balanced, there is room for difference of opinion.

Ver. 18.—אֲסַפֵּר, I number all my bones; Luther, "I may number;" the body being thus reduced and emaciated, *ut numerare possem.*

Ver. 19.—יַפִּילוּ גוֹרָל, they cast lots. This stroke completes the picture of the crucifixion of our Saviour. Aben Ezra, who refers the whole Psalm to the Jewish people, says, כְּפִי מַחְשְׁבוֹת הָאוֹיְבִים וְדִבְּרֵיהֶם, *according to the thoughts and words of the enemies, i. e.*, the enemies anticipate their victory, that they go about dividing their spoil among themselves. But when we compare this description with what has actually been fulfilled at the crucifixion of our Lord (John xix. 23, 24; Matt. xxvii. 35), nothing short of blind unbelief can fasten itself on an interpretation so incongruous.

Ver. 20.—The supplication is renewed, which ends in the assurance of deliverance. Stier remarks, "אַיֶּלֶת, ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, for אַיָּל, is an explanation of אֵלִי, in ver. 1; and אַל תִּרְחַק refers back to רָחוֹק, ver. 2; and לְעֶזְרָתִי, to אֵין עוֹזֵר, ver. 12."

Ver. 21.—Save my soul מֵחָרֶב, "*from the sword*," which is a figurative expression for "*a violent death.*" Comp. 2 Sam. xi. 24, 25, where it is applied to archery (see also Exod. xviii. 4; Job xix. 29; Zech. xiii. 7). This figure is employed also in the New Testament (Luke ii. 35) of the mind being wounded, and is a sufficient reply to the objection of Paulus and De Wette, "that no sword threatened the life of our Saviour."

מִיַּד כֶּלֶב, from the *power* of the dog, or paw; Germ. Klauen. יְחִידָתִי, "*my lovely one.*" The English version, "*my darling*," like the LXX, *μονογενῆ μοῦ*, used of an only child which one loves above all, is scarcely applicable to Christ, who taught differently in John xii. 25.

---

[1] Treatise on Biblical Criticism, vol. i., p. 406.

[2] Translation of the Psalms: New York.

The whole strain favours rather its meaning, like עֲזוּבָה, forsaken, lonely. "Solitaria et quae subsidiis omnibus destituitur" (Calvin).

Ver. 22.—מִקַּרְנֵי רְמִים עֲנִיתָנִי is a constructio pregnans: "*From the horns of the buffalo thou hast* [*heard and*] *answered me.*" Mark the transition from the imperative in הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי to the preterite עֲנִיתָנִי, thou hast heard me [by anticipation], which evidently implies confidence in the Father's help, and is the foundation of what follows; or rather, the poet is at once removed in vision from the scene of sufferings to the bright prospect of the glory that is to follow. Solom. Ben Melech says, עֲנִיתָנִי כְּמוֹ תַּעֲנֵנִי וְרַבִּים כָּמוֹהוּ בְּדִבְרֵי הַנְּבִיאָה וְרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ, "*Thou hast answered me*, i. e., *thou wilt answer me, and there are many such instances in the words of prophecy and of the Holy Spirit.*"

רְמִים, sing. רֵם, for רְאֵם; Sept., *μονοκερώτων*; Vulg., rhinoceros. It is foreign to our subject to enter upon a disquisition as to the animal here intended; suffice it to say that either "*unicorn*," which has long been regarded as a fabulous animal, and has now been proved to be a real one, or "*buffalo*," will answer to the Hebrew רְאֵם.[1]

Ver. 23.—לְאֶחָי, *to my brethren*, Heb. ii. 11, 12.

Ver. 24.—The mere anticipation expressed in the preceding verse assumes here a reality. Already does he call upon God's children to praise and honour him.

Ver. 25.—The subject of all praise in his new assembly is the exaltation of the Saviour, who thus suffered for us and was exalted.

עֲנוּת עָנִי, from ענה, *the cry of the afflicted.* So Jarchi, צְעָקַת דָּל; Chaldee, צְלוֹתְהוֹן דַּעֲנָיֵי; Syriac, ; Sept., *δεήσις*; Vulg., deprecatio. The parallel בְּשַׁוְּעוֹ is also in its favour.

The English version, "the affliction of the afflicted," making it a paronomasia, is preferred by Stier and others.

Ver. 26-27.—The joy of deliverance is described as a great feast, called in Hebrew זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים, a peace-offering, which the Saviour is to spread before his worshippers. The meek shall eat and be satisfied: Jarchi, לְעֵת הַגְּאוּלָה לִימוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "at the time of redemption, at the time of Messiah."

The nourishment of this feast is spiritual and everlasting.

[1] See Kitto's Cyclopædia of Bibl. Lit., sub v. Reem.

לְבַבְכֶם, your souls; one Cod. Kenn. reads לְבָבָם, *their heart;* so the Sept., καρδίαι αὐτῶν; and Syr., ; which are, perhaps, only free translations.

Ver. 28-30.—The importance of this event is coextensive with the boundaries of the earth. All families of the nations shall be the recipients of its bounties! He shall provide a feast where all earthly distinctions shall be removed—there, both the דִּשְׁנֵי אֶרֶץ, *the fat ones* (or prosperous) *of this earth,* and יוֹרְדֵי עָפָר, *those who are bowed down to the dust, i. e.,* who are about to die, as well as the abject and poor, וְנַפְשׁוֹ לֹא חִיָּה, *who cannot keep himself alive,* all shall be supplied in great abundance.

Ver. 31-32.—Neither is this feast limited to one generation, זֶרַע יַעַבְדֶנּוּ. This is only *the seed* from whom his whole kingdom shall arise in ages to come, and the righteousness of יְהוָה צִדְקָנוּ shall be proclaimed לְעַם נוֹלָד, *to a nation yet to be born.*

In determining the subject of this Psalm, expositors have taken different views.

I. Non-Messianic interpreters agree only in their opposition to the Messianic interpretation; in all other respects, the greatest difference prevails among them:—

a) Some take David as the subject, and refer it either to the time of Saul's persecution, or to his flight from Absalom.

But it is easy to perceive, that not one trait of David's life will answer the graphic description of this Psalm. David was never in the extremities referred to —in such a state of exhaustion. His enemies never parted his garments. Moreover, David could never have expected that his deliverance should be the cause of the conversion of all nations to Jehovah.

The same objection may be urged, with equal force at least, against the hypothesis that Jeremiah is here spoken of (Hitzig), or Hezekiah (Jahn).

b) Jarchi and Kimchi refer it to the Jewish people in their present state of dispersion: וְאָמַר דָּוִד תְּפִלָּה זֶה עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל הָעֲתִידִים לָלֶכֶת בִּגוֹלָה, "*David said this prayer concerning Israel who shall go into captivity*;" a very common mode of their exegesis, when the suffering Messiah is to be explained away.

II. Neither do Messianic interpreters agree on this point:—

a) Grotius and Venema suppose that the Psalm contains many things which must be referred only to David, and others which cannot apply but to Christ. They seek to reconcile this by the supposition that David composed this Psalm about the time of Saul's persecution, or Absalom's rebellion; but that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, he uttered many things which are applicable to him only in an inferior, or metaphorical sense, but are literally and completely fulfilled in the history of the Messiah.

Theodore of Mopsuesta first broached this opinion, for which he was condemned by the fifth Oecumenical Council. It is adopted by Clarke (Commentary), who very quaintly sets forth this theory in the following terms: "That several parts of it relate to David, primarily, there is very little reason to doubt; that several passages may be applied in way of accommodation to our Lord, though originally belonging to and expressing the state of David, may be piously believed; and that it contained portions which are direct prophecies of our Lord's passion, death, and victory, appears too evident to be safely denied. On this plan I propose to treat it in the following paraphrase, keeping it as near to the Gospel standard as I can."

The plan thus proposed is, beyond dispute, the most easy and convenient for the expositor. But though the labour of thought is thus materially abridged, yet we think it to be a very unfair way of disposing of difficult portions of Holy Writ; nor need we add, that such a system can never satisfy any inquirer after truth, it is so utterly at variance with sound criticism, that it does not call for a formal refutation.

b) More tolerable is the view of Calvin and Melancthon, adopted, with some modifications, by Stier, Umbreit, and Keil, viz., that "David, who was a type of Messiah, in contemplating upon his own sufferings, is elevated by the spirit of Messianic prophecy, and transfers his own being into the extreme sufferings of the hoped-for Messiah, and speaks as the type of the coming deliverer."

To this very plausible explanation Hengstenberg objects on psychological grounds: "Such a view appears to him inconceivable. How David could extend his own consciousness to that of his offspring cannot be conceived without the confusion of the life of souls and destruction of personal identity."

c) Hengstenberg, therefore, thinks himself, at once, fairly and completely removed from the region of embarrassment, when he assumes that "David, in this, as well as in Psalm xvi., refers neither to himself, nor to any other real person, but to

'*The ideal person of the Righteous One.*'"

His exposition may be thus stated:—

"David composed this Psalm for the use of the church, on the groundwork of his own experience, how the righteous man must suffer in this world of sin, and

how the Lord gloriously delivers him, and how his deliverance subserves to the honour of God and his kingdom. *This is the theme.*

"Every particular righteous man might appropriate to himself the consolation of this Psalm, and expect in his own experience the realization of the hopes expressed in it, in so far as the reality in him corresponds with the *idea*. With all this, the Psalm retained till the coming of Christ the character of an unfulfilled prophecy. Those who had a lively hope of the Messiah might reason thus:—

"The most perfect righteousness belongs necessarily to the idea of the Messiah.

"In this Psalm we find righteousness necessarily connected with the severest sufferings from the natural enmity of the ungodly world. *Therefore,* the Messiah, if a righteous, must also be a suffering one. Further, as we find here suffering righteousness and exalted deliverance intimately connected, we infer that this salvation, in the fullest sense, must be the lot of him who should realize in perfection the idea of suffering righteousness. Lastly, as the glory of God will be proportioned to the salvation vouchsafed, it must be in the time of the Messiah that this will, for the first time, appear in all its extent and depth as here described."[1]

Thus, or nearly thus, runs his exposition.

Now, without entering upon a long dissertation, to which this "*startling novelty*" would offer abundance of scope, we think this theory *highly* objectionable.

1. *On account of its mysticism,* which is incompatible with the simplicity of the Hebrew writers. For, how-

[1] Commentary on the Psalms.

ever simple or intuitive such process of ratiocination may appear to the learned Dr. H., it is far above the logical faculties and comprehensions of an ordinary Hebrew intellect. "One would imagine," says Professor Lee, "that the prophets would be as simple and unsophisticated in their declarations as either the evangelists or the apostles are, and that both metaphysics and duplicity would be as far removed from their discourses as could possibly be supposed:"[1] how then a Jew could find his way from the "*ideal righteous*" to a Messiah, by the mere words of the Psalmist, without the guidance of Dr. H., and how this could be designated a Divine revelation, we are at a loss to conceive. We doubt not but the sweet Psalmist of Israel himself would be at a loss in trying to repeat the different majors, minors, sorites, and dilemmas, and stare at his own logic!

2. By this hypothesis, Dr. H. did not escape his alleged psychological impossibility. For to maintain with Calvin that David was the type of Messiah, and what he says regarding himself refers to his antitype, is less "destructive to mental identity" than the supposition that he transferred his identity to an "*ideal righteous*," which may include a number of persons belonging to the class of "*righteous*;" in which case a more than ordinary stretch of imagination is requisite to extend one's identity, involving a complete "confusion of the life of souls!"

III. From these conflicting and untenable views, we turn to the "direct and exclusive Messianic reference."

In its support, let the following proofs be considered:—

[1] On the Study of Holy Scriptures, p. xxxix.

1. In the description of the sufferer, no mention is made of his sins, as in other cases where the prophet prays either for himself or in behalf of the Jewish community; on the contrary, he asks, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" (see ver. 2); from which we may infer that the sufferer in question is a sinless and holy being.

2. The description of the sufferer so harmonizes in its minutest details with the crucifixion of our Lord, that extreme dogmatic prejudice only can object to consider this Psalm as a prophetic vision of the sufferings of our Saviour and of the glory that was to follow. They may be presented as follows:—

Prophecy.	*Fulfilment.*
Ver. 2. My God, my God! why hast thou forsaken me?	Matt. xxvii. 46. Jesus cried, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?
Ver. 8. All that see me mock at me.	Matt. xxvii. 30. And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head, &c.
Ver. 9. Trust in Jehovah! he will deliver him, &c.	Matt. xxvii. 43. He trusted in God, let him deliver him.
Ver. 16. My tongue cleaveth to my jaws.	John xix. 28. That the Scripture might be fulfilled, he said, "I thirst."
Ver. 19. And upon my vesture they cast lots.	John xix. 23, 24, &c.

So that, in the light of the New Testament history, the hues and lineaments of the sufferer, described in this Psalm, become so clear and apparent that we cannot mistake his identity.

Add to this—

3. The consequences of the deliverance identical with Psalm ii., which, as shown above, excludes any other reference, and the argument is so complete that we have no choice in deciding in its favour.

Another question still remains, viz.—

Has this Psalm any historical basis? We think that it has its basis in the life of David—in his sufferings, collectively considered.

He was chosen from the sheepfold to be king over Israel; he had the pledge of the Divine promise to raise him to that throne, and yet his way to it lay amidst thorns. He was kept in perpetual anxiety, dangers, and alarm. These events God used for his instruction, and made them the occasion of bright visions respecting Messiah the true David; who himself is to drink the cup of his Father's wrath, even to the very dregs, before entering upon the possession of his glorious kingdom.

The ancient church could only look forward beyond David, to whom this מִזְמוֹר could not apply, to one in whom the whole will find its full realization and accomplishment.

Thus the ancient Jewish commentators regarded this as a direct Messianic prophecy.[1]

[1] See some specimens from the Jalkut in J. H. Michaelis' Com. in Ps., p. 138.

Elohim.

Psalm XLV.

This Psalm affords a fair specimen of oriental allegory.

Under the form of an epithalamium, the Psalmist celebrates the praises of the king Messiah—the glory of his spouse, the church—and the extension of his kingdom.[1]

The image is so exquisitely drawn, the allegory so well sustained throughout, that but for several intimations here and there which unmistakeably manifests its design, it would pass for an epithalamium, as some have erroneously imagined.

It divides itself into two principal parts, with a proemium and epilogue.

I. After a short proemium (ver. 2), he celebrates the praises of the illustrious King, who is adorned with beauty above the sons of Adam, and with sweetness of speech, on which account God made him a blessing for ever (ver. 3). After describing his heroism, his glorious exploits and achievements, his conquests in the cause of truth and righteousness (ver. 4-6), he represents him as seated on his throne, where he reigns for ever, surrounded with splendour and dignity by a noble train of princesses, who attend on his regal spouse (ver. 7-10).

II. Having mentioned the queen, he proceeds to exhort her to devote herself with undivided affection to her Lord and King, and to worship him, since she will thus

[1] Certum hic Psalmus est quasi compendium cantici canticorum (J. H. Michaelis.)

enjoy his tender love, and the highest reverence of the most flourishing nations (ver. 11-13). He next describes the splendours of the bride, when introduced to the King with her virgins (ver. 14-16).

In conclusion, he again turns to the King, wishing him an illustrious progeny, who, under his auspices, shall rule the whole earth, and expressing the hope that his name and glory shall be the theme of praise among many nations, even through all future generations (ver. 17, 18).

Ver. 1. To the chief musician upon Shoshanim.
To the sons of Korah, Maschil; a song of love.

2. My heart labours with a goodly theme;
I say my work (is) concerning the king.
My tongue, be the pen of a rapid writer!

3. Thou art adorned with beauty beyond the sons of men;
Grace is poured upon thy lips;
Therefore God hath blessed thee for ever.

4. Gird thy sword on thy thigh, O mighty one!
(Put on) thy glory and thy majesty.

5. And (in) thy majesty, ride forth victorious,
For the sake of truth, meekness, and justice,
And thy right-hand shall teach thee terrible[a] deeds.

6. Thy sharp arrows—

[a] or, *wonderful.*

Nations shall fall under thee—
(Pierce) into the heart of the king's enemies.

Ver. 7. Thy throne, O God! is for ever and ever:
A sceptre of rectitude is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

8. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness,
Therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee
With oil of joy above thy fellows.

9. Myrrh, aloe, and cassia, are all thy garments
From the ivory-palaces, string-instruments delight thee.

10. King's daughters are among thy honoured women;
At thy right hand stands the queen, with gold of Ophir.

11. Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear;
Forget thy nation and thy father's house;

12. For the king desires thy beauty.
Truly he is (now) thy Lord, do him homage.

13. And the daughters of Tyre shall entreat thy favour with a gift,
Even the richest of the nations.

14. All glorious is the king's daughter inwardly,
More than golden embroidery of her vesture.

Ver. 15. In[a] gorgeous robes she is conducted to the king,
Virgins behind her: her companions are brought unto thee.
16. They shall be conducted with rejoicings and mirth;
They shall come into the palace of the king.
17. Instead of thy fathers shall be thy sons;
Thou shalt set them for princes in all the earth.
18. I will celebrate thy name in all generations;
Therefore shall the people praise thee for ever and ever.

[a] or, *on.*

Ver. 1.—There is an accumulation of titles in this Psalm:—

Schoshanim, שׁוֹשַׁנִּים, *lilies*, is either שֵׁם כְּלִי נְגוּן, *the name of a musical instrument* (Ben Melech), or *the name of the tune* (Ben Ezra). Maschil, מַשְׂכִּיל; Chaldee: שְׁבָחָא טָבָא = Sept., εἰς σύνεσιν, *a Psalm of instruction*, or *didactic poem*. שִׁיר יְדִידוֹת is taken by some as an abstract noun; "a lovely song," lit., "*a song of loveliness*." Aquila, ᾆσμα προσφιλίας, "*a song of sweetness*." We find a similar phrase in Theocritus, Idyll. viii., προσφιλίας μέλος, "a sweet song." Psalm lxxxiv. 2, מַה־יְּדִידוֹת מִשְׁכְּנוֹתֶיךָ, "*how lovely are thy dwellings*," is commonly referred to, in support of this version; but the analogy is incorrect: there, יְדִידוֹת is the predicate agreeing with its subject מִשְׁכְּנוֹת, in the plur. fem.; whilst in our Psalm, שִׁיר is a masc. noun. Aben Ezra renders it אֲהָבִים, like the English version, "a song of loves," which accords with the rule that, "where the superscription שִׁיר is found, it always refers to the contents of the poem." (Compare Ps. xxx., xcii., and cxx.)

Ver. 2.—Nothing can be more simple or sublime than the proemium to this Psalm. We enter into the very heart of the poet, and feel, as it were, the moment the spirit of inspiration begins to operate upon his soul, to elevate him to his glorious theme.

רָחַשׁ occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament. Once in Syriac, ܪܚܫ, *throw up like a spring;* Arab., رخش, to be moved, agitated; Chaldee, בָּעָא, to throw up.

אֹמֵר אֲנִי מַעֲשַׂי is generally rendered, *I address, recite,* or *dedicate,* my work to the king; taking מַעֲשַׂי in the accusative. This is, however, contrary to the Masoretic critics, who put a disjunctive accent and kamutz in אֲנִי, which separates it from מַעֲשַׂי. S. Ben Melech has, accordingly, אֹמֵר אֲנִי בִּפְתִיחַת דְּבָרִי כִּי מַעֲשַׂי הַשִּׁיר שֶׁאֲנִי מְחַבֵּר הֵם בַּעֲבוּר מֶלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "I say in the commencement of my subject that the poem which I am composing is concerning the King Messiah."[1]

לְשׁוֹנִי, *my tongue! be,* or *let my tongue be the pen of a rapid writer* (Ewald and De Wette).

Ver. 3.—After this introduction, the poet proceeds to address the King: יָפְיְפִיתָ, "*thou art exceedingly beautiful;*" Chaldee, שׁוּפְרָךְ מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא, "thy beauty, King Messiah!" It is a reduplication of the verb יָפָה, like חַרְחַר, to be inflamed, from חָרָה, *to be angry.* Ewald reads יְפֵה יְפִיתָ, "*pulchritudinem pulcher es.*" Either of these is brought out in the rendering of Bishop Horsley,[2] which we have adopted, viz., "thou art adorned with beauty," the beauty of holiness—the beauty of the Divine image which he came to restore from the chaotic state of sin and misery.

הוּצַק חֵן בְּשִׂפְתוֹתֶיךָ, "*grace is poured upon thy lips;*" Chaldee, אִתְיְהַב רוּחַ נְבוּאָה בְּסִפְוָתָךְ, the spirit of prophecy is given into thy lips. Thus we read of our Saviour, that even his enemies confessed that "never man spake like this man;" "and all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth."

עַלכֵּן, "*therefore,*" owing to these thine intrinsic perfections and excellencies, "*God has blessed thee for ever,*" *i. e.,* made thy name a blessing, that in thy name all families of the earth should be blessed.

Ver. 4.—The poet then proceeds to celebrate the king's military exploits and valour, changing the address into the form of a direct exhortation: to gird his sword—to put on his glory and his majesty—and to ride forth into the battle-field, in defence of truth and righteousness, relying upon the strength of his own arm for the destruction of his enemies, and for the achievement of that glorious victory (Is. lxiii. 1-6).

[1] Michlal Jophí.

[2] Horsley's Sermons.

חַרְבְּךָ, when applied to our Lord, means "the sword of the Spirit," as Is. xi. 4. וְהִכָּה אֶרֶץ בְּשֵׁבֶט פִּיו, "and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth." הוֹדְךָ וְהַדָּרֶךָ, "*thy glory and thy majesty;*" supply *gird on*, put on. These are attributes ascribed to the Deity (Ps. xcvi. 6; civ. 1; cxi. 3), and form an antithesis to Isaiah's description of our Saviour, לֹא תוֹאַר וְלֹא הָדָר לוֹ, "he had neither beauty nor majesty" (liii. 2).

Ver. 5.—וְהַדָּרֶךָ (supply בְּ prefix) and in thy majesty (Rosenm.) be carried forth prosperously, *i. e.*, go forth confident in thy majestic demeanour. The Sept., *και ἐντεινοι*, as if וְהַדְרֵךְ, hiph. of דָּרַךְ, *to bend; קֶשֶׁת, bow*, being understood. Eusebius follows this interpretation, who paraphrases it, *ἔντεινον σου τὰ τόξα ἔπειτα βαλὼν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς κατευοδου καὶ βασιλευε*, "Bend thy bow, then having smitten thine enemies, proceed prosperously and reign." But the supply of קֶשֶׁת has no analogy to warrant it; and we are the less justified in doing so here when the sense is complete without it.

Ewald connects וַהֲדָרְךָ with צָלַח (prosper), rendering it, "*putting on thy glory, ride forth.*"[1] Thus, put on = צָלַח, from which the Arabic سلاح = سلح, armour, is derived.

Ver. 6.—There is a transposition in this verse: "Nations shall fall under thee" is in parenthesis.

Ver. 7.—The war being finished, the battle having been fought, and the victory gained, the Psalmist exhibits the King as seated on the throne of his mediatorial kingdom, whom he addresses, כִּסְאֲךָ אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד, "THY THRONE, O GOD! IS FOR EVER AND EVER;" or, as the Chaldee emphatically renders it, כּוּרְסְיָךְ יְקָרָךְ יְיָ קָיֵם לְעָלְמֵי עָלְמִין, "*Thy throne of glory, O Jehovah! is established for ever.*"

Expositors who are disposed to avoid the obvious ascription of Divinity to the Messiah, have tried to put another construction upon this clause. We shall give to each of these, the benefit of the full force of the arguments which they can muster in support of their respective expositions, and consider their worth:

I. Aben Ezra says, מִלַּת כִּסְאֲךָ תִּשַּׁמֵּשׁ בַּעֲבוּר אַחֶרֶת כְּמוֹ כִּסְאֲךָ כֹּסֵא א, "the word כִּסְאֲךָ serves for two, viz., כִּסְאֲךָ כֹּסֵא, thy throne (is) the throne of God, as it is said, 2 Chr. ix. 8, 'Blessed be the Lord thy God, who delighted in thee to set thee on *his throne*, to be

[1] "Deine Pracht anlegend, fahre datrin."

king for the Lord thy God.'" This is adopted by Ewald and Paulus.

But no example can be produced in favour of such an ellipsis. The only parallel passage cited by Aben Ezra in its support is 2 Chr. xv. 8, and this will be found to be a mistaken view of the passage altogether. It reads thus: "And when Aza heard these words, and the prophecy of Oded the prophet, וְהַנְּבִיאָה עֹדֵד הַנָּבִיא." The latter clause he renders, "and the prophecy was the prophecy of Oded," &c.; as if וְהַנְּבִיאָה נְבִיאַת, supplying the noun in the const. state, making it analogous to כִּסְאֲךָ כִּסֵּא of our Psalm. But in doing so, our eminent Rabbi forgot that if any noun is here to be supplied, it is not נְבִיאַת, but בֶּן (son), for Oded is not the prophet referred to, but his son Azariah, mentioned in ver. 1. We should read, accordingly, וְהַנְּבִיאָה בֶּן עוֹדֵד, "And the prophecy of the son of Oded." This refuge, therefore, has no countenance in the Hebrew *usus loquendi*.

II. Rabbi Sadja Gaon's version, "Thy throne (is) God," *i. e.*, "he is the supporter of thy throne," is still more objectionable.

a) According to this construction, it should be אֱלֹהִים כִּסְאֲךָ; first the subject and then the predicate; as יְהוָה רֹעִי, "Jehovah is my shepherd," Ps. xxiii. יְהוָה אוֹרִי וְיִשְׁעִי, "Jehovah is my light and my salvation." יְהוָה מָעוֹז חַיַּי, "Jehovah is the strength of my life," Ps. xxvii. 1. For אֱלֹהִים would thus unquestionably be the emphatic word in the sentence.

This simple rule of Hebrew syntax, though never urged by any critic, sufficiently disposes of Rabbi Sadja's ingenuity. But we would add—

b) The argument of P. Smith, viz., "The use of such a metaphor is repugnant to good taste and piety. . . . God is often called a rock, tower, and fortress of his servants, but with all these and similar metaphors, there is associated the idea of power and grandeur in a '*protecting being*;' but a throne derives its dignity from the character and dominion of the sovereign who sits upon it. The use of such a '*catachresis*' could never be adopted by any author who had a particle of correct feeling.[1]"

III. Jarchi and others take אֱלֹהִים in the vocative, but suppose that Solomon, or Messiah, is thus styled, according to the Hebrew

[1] Scripture Testimony.

usage of applying that title to judges and kings, being synonymous with שָׂר, prince; שֹׁפֵט, "judge."

It would be futile to object, with Hengstenberg, that "Nowhere is a single magistrate called אֱלֹהִים, but always the magistracy as such, representing the tribunal of God;" as we find God himself said to Moses, "See, I have made thee, אֱלֹהִים, a god to Pharaoh," Exod. vii. 1, also iv. 16.

But, on the other hand, Hengstenberg's remark is worthy of notice:—

1. "That in all the Psalms of the sons of Korah, אֱלֹהִים is the exclusive name for the Deity, instead of Jehovah."

2. Against all such forced interpretations we would urge, that the phrase עוֹלָם וָעֶד, "*For ever and ever*," cannot apply to any earthly king.

On comparing, therefore, these conflicting opinions with the Messianic interpretation of the passage in question, we cannot but perceive that, while the former are far-fetched, if not disproved by strong evidence, our version, on the other hand, is natural in its connexion with other appellations of our Saviour, *e. g.*, אֵל גִּבּוֹר אֲבִי עַד, "Mighty-God, Everlasting-Father," Is. ix. 5; יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ, "Jehovah our righteousness," Jer. xxiii. 6.

c) Our exposition is supported by all ancient versions: Chaldee (as noticed above, ver. 3); Sept., *ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεὸς εις εἰῶνα εἰῶνος*; Aquila, *ὁ θρόνος σου θεέ εἰς εἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι*; Syriac, ܟܘܪܣܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܥܠܡ ܥܠܡܝܢ, "thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." The Arabic has the sign of the vocative يَا, as كرسي يا الله الي ابد الابد

d) For those who believe in the inspiration of the writer to the Hebrews,[1] there is no room for any lingering doubt on the subject. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 1-9), these words are made the argument for the Divinity of Christ, not by forced accommodations, but according to the true intent and purpose of the Psalmist, and the literal and only consistent exposition of his words.

Ver. 8.—אָהַבְתָּ צֶדֶק, "*Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness, therefore*," &c. Righteousness is the foundation of God's throne and the fundamental principle of the government of Him "to whom the dominion belongs."

---

[1] See the best and most comprehensive discussion on the subject in Dr. Davidson's Introduction to the New Test., Vol. iii. p. 163-266.

Ver. 9.—מִן הֵיכְלֵי שֵׁן, *from the ivory palaces, i. e.*, palaces decorated with ivory. Thus we read of Ahab's ivory house (1 Kings xxii. 39). Homer describes the hall of Menelaus (Odys. iv. 72, 73):—

Χαλκοῦ τε στεροπὴν καδδωματα ἠχήεντα,
Χρυσον τ' ηλεκτρον τε και αργυρον ἠδ' ελεφαντος.

מִנִּי, *strings for*, מְנִים (Ps. cl. 4). So Schmid, Gesen., De Wette, Hitzig, &c. The Chaldee has מִאַרְעָא מְנִי, from the land of Arminia, like Jer. xv. 27; so Rosenm. But on this supposition it is difficult to dispose of the verb שִׂמְחוּךְ, they rejoice, or delight, thee.

Ver. 10.—בְּנוֹת מְלָכִים בִּיקָרֹתֶיךָ, "*King's daughters* (*are*) *among thy honoured women*," *i. e.*, among the honoured guests of this marriage are king's daughters. Horn and Horsley, "the splendour of thy train."

שֵׁגָל, queen. "By queen," says Kimchi, "we understand כְּנֶסֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל, the assembly of Israel which hereafter should become supreme." So Horsley: "The queen consort here is unquestionably the Hebrew church—the natural Israel reunited by her conversion to her husband, and advanced to the high prerogative of the mother church of Christendom; and the king's daughters are the churches which had been gathered out of the Gentiles in the interval between the expulsion of this wife and the taking of her home again; that is, between the dispersion of the Jews by the Romans and their restoration." (Comp. Hos. ii. 21, 22.)[1]

Ver. 11, 12.—Having mentioned the queen (on the principle of association), the Psalmist proceeds to apostrophize her; not, however, in the language of a courtier whose object is to flatter Pharaoh's daughter, or the queen of Persia, but he addresses her in the language of a teacher to his pupil:—

שִׁמְעִי בַת, *hearken, daughter!* It is scarcely to be thought that the poet would have felt himself at liberty to address the spouse of the king with so much familiarity.

But this goes to prove that no other queen is here meant than the church—the spouse of Christ—"who unites in herself every relation and every affection. She is daughter, wife, and sister, all in one."[2]

He exhorts her to forget her nation and her father's house, that is, all her former attachments, and renounce all her former walk and conversation in the world, and be thoroughly devoted to her present

[1] Sermons. [2] Bishop Horne.

King and Lord, וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִי לוֹ, and to do him homage; literally, to "worship him."

Ver. 13.—He then describes the honours to be conferred upon the royal spouse for her seeking to secure his love and favour, viz., וּבַת צֹר, *and as to the daughters of Tyre, i.e.*, the whole people; like בַּת עַמִּי, the daughter of my people (Lam. iv. 3); meaning the whole nation. That Tyre is used as synecdoche for "all nations" is manifest from its parallel עֲשִׁירֵי עָם, (even) *the richest of the nations* shall approach thee with presents, and court thy favour. The same is said in Is. xlix. 23:—

> "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers,
> And queens thy nursing mothers," &c.

Ver. 14.—The Psalmist returns to the continuation of his picture. Dazzled as he is with the splendour of her train and with her outward beauty, yet, says he, כָּל כְּבוּדָה בַּת מֶלֶךְ פְּנִימָה, "*all glorious is the king's daughter inwardly*," מִמִּשְׁבְּצוֹת, "*even more than the golden embroidery of her vesture.*"[1]

פְּנִימָה is rendered by De Wette and Gesenius, "in the interior" (of the palace). To this we object that the entrance into the palace is not described till ver. 15 and 16. Ewald, "to enter in" (?). It is better to take פְּנִימָה as an antithesis to לְבִישָׁה, "*her garment.*" It is very forcibly expressed by J. H. Michaelis, "Introrsum, sive intrinsicus, animi magis quam corporis gloria est; gloria non mundana quaeque, *μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας*, conjuncto sit, sed interna ac intererris hominis."[2]

מִ, מִמִּשְׁבְּצוֹת being the comparative degree more than, &c.

Ver. 15, 16.—After describing the procession when she is conducted to the king, he concludes with an address to the bridegroom (according to the oriental custom), wishing the newly-married pair a numerous and distinguished offspring.

Ver. 17.—תַּחַת אֲבוֹתֶיךָ יִהְיוּ בָּנֶיךָ. The masc. suffixes show that the Massorites understood this address as directed to the king.

---

[1] She is all glorious, for he begat her "of his own will," with "the words of his truth."

[2] The same view is taken by Herder:—

> "Des Königs Braut
> Ist Schönheit ganz! ist in Verborgenen
> Viel glängender als ihrer Kleider Gold,
> Obs alle Edelstein' auf ihrem schrunck."—*Geist. D. E. Poes.* ii. 309.

"Thy children shall be what thy fathers were, namely, God's peculiar people, and shall possess the kingdom during an endless succession of generations." (Comp. Zech. xii. 8). בְּכָל הָאָרֶץ, over all the earth. (See Ps. ii. 8.)

In reference to this passage, Rabbi Isaac (in his book Chizuk Emuna, p. 473), remarks as follows: זֶה הַמִּזְמוֹר נֶאֱמַר עַל מֶלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ אֲשֶׁר יְקִימֵהוּ הַשֵּׁם יִתְבָּרַךְ מִזַּרְעוֹ שֶׁל דָּוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ עָלָיו הַשָּׁלוֹם וְיִהְיֶה מֶלֶךְ עַל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא יִהְיֶה הֵפְסֵק לְמַלְכוּתוֹ אֲבָל יִמְלוֹךְ הוּא וּבְנוֹ וּבֶן בְּנוֹ אַחֲרָיו עַד עוֹלָם. "This Psalm was said upon the King Messiah, whom our blessed God shall raise from the seed of king David (peace upon his memory), and he shall be King over all Israel; and there shall be no end to his kingdom, but he shall reign, and his son, and his son's son after him, for ever."

Ver. 18.—אַזְכִּירָה, hiph. with ה exhortative, *let me celebrate thy name.* Chaldee, בְּעִדָּנָא הַהִיא תֵּימְרוּן נְדַכַּר שְׁמֵהּ, "At that time they shall say, Let us celebrate thy name." The Psalmist anticipates that this inspired poem will celebrate Messiah's glory through all generations, and, עַל כֵּן, because of his glory and praiseworthiness, nations shall praise him, לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד, *through endless ages.*

All efforts of some modern expositors to refer this Psalm to any other subject than Messiah and his church have signally failed.

To say that this Psalm was addressed either to Solomon (on the occasion of his marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh, 1 Kings iii. 5), or to any other of the Hebrew kings, is not only to reduce this sublime allegory to a prosy flattery of a courtier, but also incompatible with sound interpretation of the text.

Neither of the Hebrew kings could be addressed "God! whose throne is for ever and ever;" of neither of them could it be said that "Nations shall praise them through endless ages," &c.

Still less could this Psalm have been composed at the

nuptials of a Persian king (Augusti). Rosenmuller, who formerly held that view, has now (2nd Edition) abandoned it, with the remark that "non-Messianic interpreters have no claim to the merit of correct exposition of the Psalm."

All such interpretations, moreover, rest upon a disregard to the inspiration and authority of the canonical books. Neither of them seems sufficiently to consider that the Jews would never have used any such poem in the sacred service of the temple, nor would have admitted it into that canon which they believed to be "the highest source of all true wisdom and knowledge."[1]

Hence, when we find that both Christian and Jewish commentators refer it to Messiah (see our exposition, ver. 2, 3, 17), and that this view is confirmed by an inspired writer in the New Testament, we are constrained to infer, not with Calvin (Grotius and Stier), "hic Psalmum primo et tenuiore sensu ad Solomonem, secundo et typico ac uberiore ad Messiam pertinere," but with Venema, "Ex mea sententia Messias hic directe et ex prima autoris sive spiritus intentione omnino representatur."

But in adopting the direct and exclusive Messianic interpretation, we must not on that account detach it from historic basis—from where the Spirit of God moves and elevates the seer into the future.

In looking, therefore, to the lives of the sacred men and leaders of the theocracy, who furnish the materials, as it were, of sacred history, we cannot find a more appropriate ground upon which the sublime structure of

---

[1] Stuart on the Old Testament Canon, p. 279.

this Psalm could be raised than the occasion of Solomon's marriage to the daughter of the king of Egypt. For, believing as we do that "Israel, with all its institutions and its history, was a prophecy of the future,"[1] it appears very natural that such an event, namely, the marriage of the Hebrew king with Pharaoh's daughter, should furnish the prophet (a Korahite, or whoever he was) with imagery for painting the coming Messianic glory—when Gentile nations shall be betrothed to the king Messiah—with that matchless splendour of royalty which he nowhere witnessed in a higher degree than in the court of Solomon on that occasion.

[1] Tholuck, The Old Testament in the New.

Messiah's Kingdom.

Psalm LXXII.

In our comment on 2 Sam. xxiii. 1,[1] we have already remarked that David considered his dynasty as established upon those promises relating to his descendant to whom the kingdom belongs.[2]

The King Messiah, "who is the desire of all nations,"[3] was the special object upon whom Israel's hopes have been concentrated. Hence the Jewish nation were taught always to look forward to the glorious era of his reign. Their prophets never expatiated upon the blessings of a primeval life; but all the sublime and sacred strains of their visions were conversant with the future.

Solomon, also, who had raised the kingdom to the highest state of prosperity, could not find repose in the present, but looked forward to a glorious kingdom to be governed by the promised Saviour. In the sunshine and meridian brightness of his glory, he could discern but faint glimmerings and foreshadowings of that Sun of Righteousness, who will come to enlighten all nations, and vivify the whole world.

This Psalm of Solomon sufficiently attests the correctness of the foregoing remarks.

The Psalmist very vividly describes the King Messiah, whose reign is characterized by profound peace and righteousness (ver. 2, 5, 6, 12), lasting as long as

---

[1] See p. 47. [2] 1 Chron. xxxviii. 4. [3] Haggai ii. 7.

the sun and moon (5, 17), and whose dominion shall be coextensive with the boundaries of the earth (8-10), who is the veneration of all kings and nations, who freely choose his service (10, 11), under the influence of his peaceful and righteous sway. Lastly, in whom the promise made to the fathers shall be accomplished, namely, that in his name all families of the earth shall be blessed (ver. 17).

To Solomon.

Ver. 1. Give, O God, thy judgment to the king,
And thy righteousness to the king's son.
2. He will judge thy people with righteousness,
And thy afflicted with equity.
3. The mountains shall bear peace to the people,
And the hills (shall be covered) with righteousness.
4. He shall judge the poor of the people,
He shall save the children of the needy,
And shall crush the oppressor.
5. They shall fear thee as long as the sun (endureth)[a]
And the moon, throughout all generations.
6. He shall descend like rain upon a mown (meadow),
Like showers saturating[b] the earth.
7. In his days shall the righteous flourish,

[a] lit. *with the sun.*

[b] or, *upon languishing.*

And abundance of peace until the moon vanishes.

Ver. 8. And he shall rule from sea to sea,
And from the river to the ends of the earth.

9. Before him shall crouch the inhabitants of the wilderness,
And his enemies shall lick the dust.

10. The kings of Tarshish and the isles shall bring presents;
The kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts.

11. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him;
All nations shall serve him.

12. For he shall deliver the needy who crieth (for help),
And the poor, and him that has no helper.

13. He will have pity[a] on the poor and needy,
And the souls of the needy he will save.

14. From oppression[b] and from violence he will redeem their souls,
And their blood shall be precious in his sight.

15. He shall live,[c] and shall give him of gold of Sheba,
And shall pray for him continually.

16. There shall be abundance of corn in the land
Upon the top of the mountains.

[a] lit. *spare*.

[b] or, *deceit*.

[c] Heb. vii. 1.

Its fruit shall wave like Lebanon;
And they[a] shall flourish from the city like the grass of the land.
Ver. 17. His name shall live for ever;
As long as the sun (shines) shall his name be perpetuated;
And all nations shall be blessed in him and call him blessed.
18. "Blessed be Jehovah God, the God of Israel,
Who alone does wonders.
19. And blessed be his glorious name for ever,
And let the whole earth be filled with his glory;
Amen and Amen."

[a] sup. *inhabitants.*

Ver. 1.—The title לִשְׁלֹמֹה is rendered by some "*to*," or "*for*" *Solomon*. Thus among the later Jewish expositors, Kimchi and Jarchi; also the LXX, εἰς Σαλωμών; followed by Calvin, Geier, who—with certain modifications—seem to agree that David composed this Psalm concerning the reign of Messiah, of whom Solomon was a type, which Stier[1] seeks to defend at great length.

But we are not shut up to this precarious hypothesis by the concluding verse 20, "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended;" as this postscript refers to the second book of the collection, and not to this Psalm in particular. We therefore take, with Hengstenberg and Keil, the לְ in לִשְׁלֹמֹה in its more simple and usual acceptation, and accordingly regard Solomon as the author of this, as well as of Ps. cxxvii. So the Chaldee: עַל יְדוֹי דִשְׁלֹמֹה אִתְאֲמַר בְּנְבוּאָה, "Spoken by Solomon prophetically."

The Psalm opens with a prayer, "O God, give thy judgment to

[1] Anserwälte Psalmen.

the king!" (Chaldee, אֱלָהָא הַלְכָת דִּינָךְ לְמַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא, "Give, O God, sentences of thy judgment to King Messiah"), that is, grant that the judgment which thou hast promised to *the* King Messiah may speedily be bestowed upon him; may he soon come in his great power, and reign.[1]

בֶּן מֶלֶךְ, *the king's son, i. e.*, the legitimate successor of the throne; the greatest and most distinguished of David's sons. The Ottoman emperor is styled upon the Turkish coins, السلطان بن السلطان "Sultan, the son of a sultan."

Ver. 2.—יָדִין, *he will judge*. This verb and the following are in the future, expressing the result of his coming.

Ver 3.—The mountains, *i. e.*, the most conspicuous part of the world, shall reflect the brightness of his rising, the splendour and felicity of his reign. וּגְבָעוֹת בִּצְדָקָה, *and the hills* (shall be covered, or loaded) *with righteousness*. The common version, *by*, or *through* righteousness, does not make the sense complete; we must therefore supply some verb corresponding to יִשְׂאוּ.

Ver. 5.—יִרָאוּךְ, *They shall fear thee*. The poet addresses the King himself, saying, "The result of thine administration of justice will be, that they shall fear thee, עִם שֶׁמֶשׁ, *with the sun*," that is, so long as the sun endureth; Sept. *συμπαραμενεῖ τῷ ἡλίῳ*. דּוֹר דּוֹרִים, generationes generationum, may either be supplied with יִרָאוּךְ, meaning, "All generations shall fear thee," or (as Rosenm.) with בְּ prefix, *in*, or *during* all generations.

Ver. 6.—יֵרֵד כַּמָּטָר, *he descends like rain upon*, גֵּז, a "*mown meadow*," from גָּזַז, to *shear* (Amos vii. 1). זַרְזִיף, "*saturating*," is found only once here. It is, according to Lee, a compound from the Syr., ܙܰܪ̈ܙܶܦ̈ܳܢ, imber vehemens, and ܙܽܘܦ, *stillavit*. Kimchi (Liber Radicum) derives it from זָרַף, *scidit, incidit*; hence זַרְזִיף, *super fissuras terrae*; like rain upon *the split* (dry, or languishing) *earth*."

Ver. 8.—And he shall rule from sea to sea, &c.; Chaldee, מִן קְטַר יַמָּא רַבָּא לְסִטַר יַמָּא דְאוּקְיָנוֹס, from the shore of the great sea even to the shore of the ocean.

Ver. 9.—צִיִּים, *the inhabitants of the wilderness*; Sept., Αἰθιοπες.

[1] De Wette's objection, that "this prayer is inconsistent with the character of Messiah, who is the most righteous," is justly directed against the view commonly taken by commentators of this passage, and is obviated by our version.

Ver. 10.—תַּרְשִׁישׁ, *Tartessus*, in Spain, is here mentioned as the most distant place in the *West*. שְׁבָא, *Sheba*, a region in Arabia Felix, and סְבָא, *Seba*, is the name given to the ancient kingdom of Meroe (an island on the Nile, and then to the interior of Africa); they stand here for the most distant places in the *East* and *South*.

אֶשְׁכָּר, a *gift, presented as a token of gratitude*; Gr., *εὐχαριστιρόν*.

Ver. 14.—תּוֹךְ, *oppression;* Engl. version, deceit = Luther, *Trug*. The Syr., ܥܘܫܩܐ, admits of both interpretations.

Ver. 15.—וְיִחְיֶ, *And he, viz., the King shall live* (Is. liii. 8, 10; Heb. vii. 1), וְיִתֶּן לוֹ, *and shall give to him, i. e.*, to the poor who has no helper (ver. 12), מִזְּהַב שְׁבָא, *from the gold of Sheba*, the most precious gold, וְיִתְפַּלֵּל בַּעֲדוֹ תָּמִיד, *and make constant intercession for him* (Heb. vii. 25; Eph. i. 3).

The LXX, *καὶ δοθήσεται αυτῷ*; (Engl. version), and to him (the King) shall be given. But this, as well as Hengstenberg's exposition, "And he (viz., the poor man) shall live and give to the King," &c., involve an unnecessary change of person. Besides, it is more reasonable to expect that the King, "of whose fulness we have all received grace for grace" (John i. 10), should, out of his treasures, supply the want of the poor, than *vice versâ*.

Ver. 16.—There shall be פְּסַת בַּר, *abundance of corn;* Arab., فسّ *diffudit;* Chald., פְּסָה; Heb., פָּשָׂה, to extend. Aben Ezra and Kimchi render, "*a handful.*" "Let there be sown a mere handful of corn even on the top of the mountain, and its fruit shall wave like Lebanon."[1]

And they shall flourish, מֵעִיר, *from the city* (for cities) collectively; supply יוֹשְׁבִים, the *inhabitants*.

With the fertility of the earth the Psalmist connects the increase of the people.

---

[1] Of the wild and grotesque scenes which the Rabbis expected to witness at the coming of Messiah—"the great feast," for instance—where myriads of angels shall act in the capacity of waiters to the righteous, and others play all sorts of musical instruments to the dancing sun, moon, and stars, &c., the inference drawn from this passage is certainly not inferior in originality. Rabbi Chaga, the son of Rabbi Joseph, said, עֲתִידָה אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁתּוֹצִיא גְּלוּסְקָאוֹת וּכְלֵי מִלֹּת, "The land of Israel shall [in the days of Messiah] bring forth, *i. e.*, it shall grow, ready-made, cakes, and clothes of fine wool, as it is written, Psalm lxxii. 16."

Ver. 17.—לִפְנֵי שֶׁמֶשׁ, *for*, or *in presence of the sun, i. e.*, as long as the sun shines, יִנּוֹן שְׁמוֹ, *his name shall be propagated*, or perpetuated. יִנּוֹן, niphal נוּן; LXX, διαμενεῖ; Syr., ܫܡܗ ܢܬܛܝܠ, his name shall be. The verb נוּן, which occurs only in this place, is explained from the noun נִין (Gen. xxi. 23; Job xviii. 19; Is. xiv. 22), where it has the meaning "offspring," rendered by the Chaldee בַּר, *son*. This sense is also attached, by some, to the verb under consideration; thus Seb. Schmid, "Namen filii habebit;" and the Medrash, who draws the inference that "the Messiah was born before the creation of the world, as it is written, Ps. lxxii. 17, לִפְנֵי שֶׁמֶשׁ יָנוֹן שְׁמוֹ, from eternity was his name is called Son;" adding, וְלָמָּה נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ יִנּוֹן שֶׁהוּא עָתִיד לִינִין לִישֵׁנֵי עָפָר, "Why is he called (Yenon) Son? because he will raise all them who sleep in the earth."[1]

Ver. 18, 19.—The following doxology is commonly taken like the postscript, as belonging to the second book. Ewald even puts it at the end of the Psalms. Others, again, think that these are the words of the author, who carries out his idea by giving the very words, as it were, in which the nation shall praise the Lord.

After our exposition of this Psalm, we think it would be needless to say much in proof of its Messianic character. All arguments would, in our estimation, be spent only to prove what must appear self-evident to every attentive reader of the exposition.

The whole description is obviously reaching far beyond the Solomonic period, and is only an echo of the promise given to David of the מוֹשֵׁל בָּאָדָם צַדִּיק, ruler over all men, the Righteous One (2 Sam. xxiii. 1; compare p. 46).

Even the Jewish commentators decide in its favour. Thus:—

---

[1] Quoted by Eisenmenger, vol. ii., p. 897.

(1). The Chaldee (see ver. 1).

(2). Aben Ezra, ver. 1 and 17, שְׁלֹמֹה אוֹ הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "Solomon or Messiah."

(3). Jarchi, וְרַבּוֹתֵינוּ פֵּרְשׁוּהוּ לְיָמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ וְכָל הַמִּזְמוֹר בְּמֶלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "And our Rabbis refer it to Messiah, and indeed the whole Psalm relates to Messiah."

(4). The Medrash, as in ver. 17.

Even the attempt of Hitzig to fasten this Psalm upon Ptolemaeus Philadelphus, and the objection of Köster and Lengerke, that "the idea of a personal Messiah is not found till the time of the prophets," only prove the futility of any other exposition, and that no reasonable objection can be urged against its reference to Messiah's reign of peace.

Melchizedek.

Psalm CX.

This Psalm completes the prophetic picture of the conquering Messiah drawn in Psalm ii.

The King—the Son of God—the heir and installed ruler over the whole earth (Ps. ii.), is here represented as seated at the right hand of God, invested not only with regal dignity, surrounded by a devoted host of warriors, but also with the office of an intercessor, a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.

This office is solemnly proclaimed, and its perpetuity insured by a Divine oath. He executeth judgment over his enemies; he only pronounces their doom, and they lie utterly prostrate at his feet.

The historic basis of this Psalm seems to be found in 2 Sam. vi. 12-17. When the ark of the covenant was brought to Mount Zion, David himself, clothed in sacerdotal robes (ephod), acted the part of a priest, offering sacrifices, and pronouncing the devout prayers of the people. This is likely to have been the occasion when the Spirit of Jehovah revealed to him his illustrious Son and Lord, the true David, whose regal and sacerdotal offices shall endure for ever, because united with God's own throne, concerning whom he thus sang:—

By David. A Psalm.

Ver. 1. The saying of Jehovah to my Lord;
Sit at my right hand, until I make thine
enemies thy footstool.

Ver. 2. The sceptre of thy strength shall Jehovah send out of Zion.
Rule in the midst of thine enemies.
3. Thy people are ready[a] in the day of thine army.
Upon the holy mountains, from the womb of the morning,
(proceeds) To thee the dew of thy youth.
4. Jehovah has sworn, and will not repent,
Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.
5. The Lord at thy right hand smites kings in the day of his wrath.
6. He executeth judgment among the nations,
He fills (places) with corpses,
He has smitten chiefs[b] over the wide earth.
7. He shall drink of the brook in the way;
Therefore shall he lift up the head.

[a] lit. *readiness.*

[b] lit. *chief.*

Ver. 1.—לְדָוִד, by David. We take the לְ as regularly, referring to the author. The courageous, bold, and warlike tone itself, would justify us in ascribing it to David, the poet and warrior, as its author.[1]

The Hebrew noun נְאֻם, dictum; Arab., نَعَمٌ and نُعْمٌ, is chiefly applied to the oracle of Jehovah. לַאדֹנָי, "To my Lord," implies that the person spoken of is the superior of the Psalmist; hence the question put by our Lord to the Pharisees, "If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" (Matt. xxii. 43-45).

Then follows the import of the oracle, שֵׁב לִימִינִי, "sit at my right

[1] "Der muthige, frische, kriegerische Ton führt auf dem Helden David dem allein dieser Ton eigenthümlich ist" (Keil).

hand," *i. e.*, "administer the affairs of the kingdom as joint partaker of my majesty and power" (Rosenmüller).[1]

The Psalmist David sees the full development of his kingdom; it is to be changed into the kingdom of God.

The same is said of the Son of Man, "who came with the clouds of heaven," viz., "there was given to him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (Dan. vii. 13, 14).

יָמִין, "*right hand*," is sometimes synonymous with כֹּחַ, might (Ps. xx. 7), and יָשַׁב denotes, also, "to remain," "wait." Jarchi translates, accordingly, שֵׁב לִימִינִי, "expect my aid, look to me for assistance;" and Grotius, "securus esto fiducia auxilii mei," which is certainly a fair specimen of Talmudistic twist, but contrary to the Hebrew usage of the phrase. עַד, "until," is not the terminus ad quem, till then and no longer, but is to be taken in the same sense as in Gen. xlix., to which see our exposition (p. 32).

אָשִׁית, from שִׁית, to *put, place thine enemies.* הַדֹּם לְרַגְלֶיךָ = מְקוֹם רַגְלֶיךָ (Is. lx. 13); Arab., هدم, to throw to the ground, *prostrate;* Sept., ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 24).

Ver. 2.—מַטֵּה עֻזְּךָ, the rod, or sceptre of THY power. (Hieronymus), "insigne regiae potestatis." יִשְׁלַח יְהוָה, *shall Jehovah send;* Sept., Ῥάβδον δυνάμεως ἐξαποστελεῖ; Syr., ; and Arab., يُرْسِلُ لَكَ الرَّبُّ, "the sceptre of strength shall Jehovah send to thee," as if מַטֵּה עֹז יִשְׁלַח לְךָ יְהוָה.[2]

---

[1] Pindar says of Minerva, that she was seated at the right hand of the father (Jove), to receive commands for the gods:—

δεξιὰν κατα χεῖρα
τοῦ πρὸς καθεζομενην
ταν εντολὰς τοῖς θεοῖς
ἀπεδέχεσθαι.

[2] The Jalkut Shimani says: הוּא הַמַּטֶּה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה בְּיַד־כָּל מֶלֶךְ וָמֶלֶךְ עַד שֶׁחָרַב בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ וְנִנְנַז וְעָתִיד לְיִמְסוֹר בְּיַד מֶלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ וּבוֹ עָתִיד לְיַרְדוֹת אֶת עַמּוֹת הָעוֹלָם לָכֵן נֶאֱמַר מַטֵּה עֻזְּךָ יִשְׁלַח כִּי, "This is the sceptre which every king had in his hand till the destruction of the temple, [when

Ver. 3.—עַמְּךָ נְדָבוֹת, *Thy people* (shall be) *ready*, or willing, literally, "*willingness*;" abstract for the concrete. The term נְדָבָה is used of a free-will offering. Thus hithpael, הִתְנַדֵּב, to dedicate one's self to the Lord (Ex. xxxv. 21, 29; 1 Chr. xxix. 14, 17).[1]

בְּיוֹם חֵילֶךָ, *in the day of thine army*, that is, "when thou musterest thine army for battle, thy people shall freely offer themselves to thy service, and flock to thy banners." Sept., *μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν ἡμέρα*, "with thee (עִמְּךָ) is the government in the day," &c.

בְּהַדְרֵי־קֹדֶשׁ is commonly rendered, "*in the beauty of holiness*," which gives to the war the character of a sacred ceremony (1 Sam. vii. 9; Is. xiii. 3; Jer. vi. 4; Joel iv. 9), when the עַם נְדָבוֹת are described as arrayed in holy attire.

This rendering, however, does not well agree either with the preceding or following member of the sentence. We therefore prefer, with De Wette, the reading בְּהַרְרֵי ק, *on the holy mountains*, which is found in many Codd., and adopted by Hier. and Symm., making the figure complete, viz., "upon the holy mountains, מֵרֶחֶם מִשְׁחָר לְךָ טַל יַלְדֻתֶךָ, *from the womb of the morning* [supply יוֹצֵא, proceeds] *to thee the dew of thy youth*." Thomson—

> "And soon, observant of approaching day,
> The meek-eyed morn appears, mother of dews."

Lowth renders, "Beyond the womb of the morning is the dew of thy offspring to thee;"[2] that is, "more copious and abundant than the dew which proceeds from the womb of the morning is the dew of thy youth." The ellipsis of the text, according to this interpretation, when supplied and rendered into prose, will read, טַל יַלְדֻתֶךָ יִהְיֶה לְךָ מֵרֶחֶם שָׁחַר, The Redeemer's youths, *i. e.*, those who constitute his spiritual body or church, perpetually succeed one another; hence he has perpetual youth, because his troops, or array, are ever springing forth a fresh race after race.

The Sept., *ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγεννησά σε*, followed by the

---

when it was treasured up, and shall be put into the hand of Messiah, by which he shall rule all nations of the world, and therefore is it said (Ps. cx. 2), 'The rod of thy strength he shall send,' &c."

[1] The Arabic: اندب نفسه, he has freely offered *himself*, or his life. De Wette renders, accordingly, "Dein Volk folgt willig deinem Rufe zu den Waffen;" like Aben Ezra: יִתְנַדְּבוּ לְהִלָּחֵם בַּעֲבוּרֶךָ.

[2] De Sacra Poesi Hebr., Proel. x.

Vulgate and Arabic, مِنَ ٱلْبَطْنِ قَبْلَ كوكب المدع والدك, "from the womb (*i. e.* from myself), before the morning star have I begotten thee," as if מִשַּׁחַר יְלַדְתִּיךָ.[1]

This version has been current in the Church before the Reformation. Hierony. and other Church fathers urged it as a proof of the eternal Sonship of Christ against Arius. They all omit לְךָ טַל from the text. Whether these two words were awanting in their MSS., or whether it was only a free version of the Sept., which the other translators followed, is difficult to determine.

Meanwhile, we may perhaps class it with that important discovery made by an early Church father, of the name of the Virgin in this clause, by confounding מִרְחָם with מִרְיָם, Mirjam = Mary.

Ver. 4.—נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה וְלֹא יִנָּחֵם, JEHOVAH HAS SWORN, AND WILL NOT REPENT HIM; that is, his decree is unchangeable. This formula leads us to expect, that what is mentioned in the words immediately following cannot be but of the highest importance—altogether singular; the announcement, accordingly, is quite of that description, viz.—

אַתָּה כֹהֵן לְעוֹלָם עַל־דִּבְרָתִי מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק, "*thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.*" Messiah is to be the successor of him who held the co-ordinate offices of king and priest of the Most High God.

Melchizedek is altogether a hieroglyphic personage. His name, מַלְכִּי צֶדֶק, denotes "king of righteousness." In the city of שָׁלֵם, "peace," he held the office of king and priest even before the institution of the Aaronic priesthood. In all these particulars he is an eminent type of Christ, (Stier). See Hebrews vii. 15.

דִּבְרָתִי for דִּבְרַת, with י paragogic, and is explained by Aben Ezra, בְּמִנְהָג, *after the order* of; so Sept., *κατα τὴν τάξιν*. The Syriac renders ܥܠ ܕܡܝܢ, "in the likeness of," which is adopted by the writer to the Hebrews (vii. 15), *κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιοτητα* Μελχισεδεκ. In the Syrian church, accordingly, Melchizedek is styled ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܘܕܡܘܬ, "type and likeness of the Messiah."[2]

Aben Ezra's version, "because thou art like Melchizedek," implies

[1] The Syriac: "In the beauties of holiness, from the womb from old, ܐܝܠܕܬܟ ܠܟ ܒܪܝܪ, I have begotten thee as a son."

[2] Jacob of Edessa, quoted by Tholuck on the Hebrews.

an ellipsis of אַתָּה כִּ from the text. Kimchi, following the Chaldee, בִּגְנִין זְכוּתָא דְהַוִיתָא מַלְכָּא זַכַּי, takes מַלְכִּי צֶדֶק, not as a proper noun, but as an appellative, "righteous king;" and עַל דִּבְרָתִי as in Eccles. vii. 14, "an account of;" and, to cram the whole clause with anomalies, כֹּהֵן is rendered servant-king, and the meaning is, "Thou art a king for ever, for thou art a righteous king." Grotius, evidently translating without a lexicon, renders עַל דִּבְרָתִי, "secundum meam *constitutionem* O, rex mi juste!"

Such versions, if they happen to be free from gross philological blunders, take away the animus of the poetic diction, and leave it tame, insipid, and awkward.

Zechariah's prophecy (vi. 12, 13) of the regal priesthood is closely connected with the passage under consideration.

Ver. 5.—The Psalmist continues his address to King Messiah, אֲדֹנָי עַל יַד יְמִינְךָ, "The Lord at thy right hand." אֲדֹנָי stands for יְהוָה, and יְמִינְךָ relates to the King who is the subject of the Psalm. So the Chaldee, שְׁכִנְתָּא דְיָ עַל יַד יְמִינָךְ, "The Shechina of Jehovah at thy right hand." Indeed, יְהוָה is found in seventeen MSS. of Kennicott.

The Messiah, having assumed his regal power, he shall, by virtue of that office given to him by the Father, and by his assistance, proceed to the destruction of his rebellious enemies. Stier and others understand יְמִינֶךָ as addressed to God the Father, and אֲדֹנָי as relating to Messiah.

Hieronymus seeks to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between יְהוָה עַל יַד יְמִינְךָ and ver. 1, where Messiah is represented as seated at the right hand of God the Father, by supposing, "hoc tantum propterea dicitur, ut aequalis sit filius patri."

מָחַץ, pret. (for יִמְחַץ), the prophetic future (see Gramm. § 225, 2 E), "he shall wound kings who oppose thine authority."

Ver. 6.—יָדִין, for דִּין, or דָּן, he will execute judgment over nations; and, as the result, מָלֵא, *he shall* fill (מְקוֹמוֹת, places) *with dead bodies.* מָלֵא is, accordingly, a transitive verb, and the parallel of יָדִין and מָחַץ. רֹאשׁ, collectively, "heads," על ארץ רבה, *upon the wide earth.* Sept., *ἐπὶ γῆς πολλῶν*, and Engl. version, "over many countries," correspond with S. Ben Melech, who takes רַבָּה as an adjective plur. collectively, and compares it with בְּסוֹד קְדוֹשִׁים רַבָּה, Ps. lxxxix. 8.

Mendelsohn makes רַבָּה to denote the city of the Amalekites, and רֹאשׁ, "chief" prince; thus, "He shall smite the prince over the land of Rabbah," that is, "of that land of which Rabbah was the principal city."

To this, Rosenmüller and De Wette justly object, that אֶרֶץ רַבָּה cannot be taken for אֶרֶץ בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן, "The land of the children of Ammon" (Deut. ii. 37; Josh. xiii. 25); as no Hebrew would ever have said אֶרֶץ יְרוּשָׁלַם, "the land of Jerusalem," for אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל, "the land of Israel." To this we may add, that עַל is never placed between two nouns in construction when the first is in the accusative. The Psalmist would have said (if that had been his object to express) רֹאשׁ אֶרֶץ רַבָּה.

Ver. 7.—The Psalmist then continues his description of the battle, representing the Messiah as unwearied in his exertions against his foes. "Though fatigued with the slaughter of his enemies, yet will he not desist, but, having refreshed himself with water taken from the nearest stream, will exert his renovated strength in the pursuit of his foes" (Schnurrer).[1]

Michaelis and others think נַחַל to signify a stream of blood, from which (יִשְׁתֶּה) "*he shall drink*;" used figuratively for, "he shall be appeased." Stier understands by נַחַל, "the cup of sufferings which the Saviour was to drink; the billows of anguish rushing over him. עַל כֵּן, *therefore*, having thus suffered, יָרוּם רֹאשׁ, he shall raise his head, *or be glorified*."[2]

That this Psalm is a direct prophetic description of Messiah is established upon the following considerations:

I. The Jews, to whom the oracles were in the first instance given, seem to have understood it as a direct

---

[1] Hufnagel's remark upon this Psalm is worthy of notice: "I wonder much at those who say they are offended with the representation given in the 110th Psalm. They cannot bear the cruel disposition of the Messiah towards his enemies, and think all such representation at variance with the meekness and gentleness that distinguished him. . . . The matter is quite plain: under the figure of a king avenging his people and frustrating his enemies, the poet shadows forth the Messiah, and this teaches us to what country he belonged."

[2] Siebenzig anserwählte Psalmen, &c.

Messianic prophecy, even at a very early period of their history.

This is apparent, not only from the Jalkut[1] and Rabbi G. Gaon,[2] but also from the testimony of Christ himself (Matt. xxii. 43), who, in his question put to the Pharisees, tacitly assumes their assent to this exposition, which must have been the uncontradicted and current view of this Psalm. (Comp. Luke xx. 42). Mark xii. 36 is more explicit: *ἐν πνευματι τω ἁγιω.*

II. The traditionary interpretation just mentioned is based upon the internal evidences of the Psalm itself, viz.—

a) David being its author, as proved from the title, and attested by Christ himself; hence the subject designated by him אדני, "my Lord," must be greater than King David.

b) He is spoken of as sitting at the right hand of God (see exposition, ver. 2).

c) He is to hold the co-ordinate offices of priest and king for ever, which cannot apply to any earthly ruler.

III. These arguments will derive additional strength when we consider that all attempts of modern Jews to find another subject than Messiah have completely failed.

Every hypothesis which excludes Messiah from our Psalm is untenable, if not quite absurd, *e. g.*—

(1). Aben Ezra thinks that this מִזְמוֹר was composed by some poet, when David was rescued from imminent danger by the valour of Abishai: at that time "the men of David sware unto him, saying, Thou shalt no more go out with us to battle, that thou quench not the

[1] See Note on ver. 2 *supra.*

[2] His remark on Dan. vii. 13 is: וְהוּא מְשִׁיחַ צִדְקֵנוּ כְּמוֹ דִכְתִיב נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי לַאדֹנִי כ, "This is Messiah, who is our righteousness, as it is written, 'The Lord said unto my Lord,' &c."

light of Israel" (2 Sam. xxi. 17). This circumstance, he thinks, is referred to by the poet in ver. 1: "Remain in Zion, trusting in my aid, for though thou be absent from the battle, I will subject to thee all thine enemies."

This, as noticed in our exposition, is contrary to the Hebrew usage of the phrase שֵׁב לִימִינִי; neither could the poet have said regarding David, that Jehovah has sworn to constitute him a priest for ever.

(2). Equally repugnant to the solemn tone of the Psalm is the hypothesis of Mendelsohn, viz., that it has been composed by a Hebrew poet, when David, having put the Ammonites to flight, sent Joab with an army to besiege Rabbah, their chief city, whilst he himself remained at home in Jerusalem.

The objections urged against the former will have their full force against this view, with the addition that the whole conjecture rests upon a misinterpretation of the word רַבָּה, as proved in our exposition (ver. 6).

(3). The reference of this Psalm to Solomon (Borhek), to Hezekiah (Justin Martyr), or to Abraham (Jarchi), or, indeed, to any other personage that may be suggested at random, is liable to the same objections.

But the Christian derives his most convincing proofs from the words of the Saviour himself. His testimony is as explicit as words can render it: "How say the scribes that Christ is the son of David? For David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand," &c. (Mark xii. 35).

The answer, then, to this question is to be found in the fact, that the subject of our Psalm is both the son of David and the Son of God, our eternal מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק, King of Righteousness and eternal Intercessor.

The Psalms quoted in the New Testament.

We have thus far considered those Psalms, which are strictly and exclusively prophetic descriptions of Messiah and his kingdom, viz., Psalm ii., xvi., xxii., xlv., lxxii., and cx.

The Messianic character and import of these, is sufficiently vindicated and established upon historico-critical ground. Their external as well as their internal evidences, unite in proving, that Messiah is their subject throughout, to the exclusion of all others. We now proceed to consider the other passages from the Book of Psalms, quoted in the New Testament, by Christ and his Apostles. It is to these quotations chiefly, that the alleged primary and secondary senses of Holy Writ, and all those mystical interpretations which have exercised such a detrimental influence upon Sacred Hermeneutics, owe their origin. Expositors, seeing that the New Testament writers, apply certain passages of the Old Testament, evidently in a different sense from their original and primary import, sometimes even departing from the precise phraseology of the writer whom they quote, thought themselves called upon to vindicate this apparent incongruity, by resorting to the most violent expedients

which human ingenuity could devise, instead of honestly meeting the difficulty upon rational principles of interpretation.[1]

No rational interpreter of the present generation, will deny, that Christ and his Apostles apply many passages of the Old Testament Scriptures, to objects, different from their original design; as, those specific applications made by them, estrange those passages from the connexion in which they occur in the Old Testament. But, must we then on that account assert, that, "either the applications made by Christ and his Apostles, are fanciful and unauthorized, and wholly inadequate to prove the point for which they were cited;" or, on the other hand, make Christ and his Apostles the propounders of mystical senses, in addition to the obvious and literal ones?

We emphatically say, that we are shut up to neither of these alternatives. But upon a strict examination of the passages in question, it will be seen, that the New Testament writers, by quoting them, never intended their detachment from the original connexion, nor to countenance a system of mystical interpretation of any description.

Those parts of the Old Testament (or of the Psalms, which we are at present particularly examining), which have no direct reference to Christ, nor appear, from their connexion, to have ever been intended as such, are quoted by Christ and his Apostles:

I. *Either simply as metaphrasis, i. e.*, where the words of the Old Testament writers, are made the substratum

[1] A history of these fanciful interpretations, in the different stages of their development, is given in *Davidson's "Sacred Hermeneutics;"* a work which has contributed more to sound exegesis than any book in the English language.

for their own ideas,[1] thus they use the language and phrases of those writers as both apposite and familiar to their hearers; or,

II. *For the sake of pointing out the organic resemblance between the facts recorded in the Old Testament, and those in the New;* that it is the same Jehovah, the same Spirit who is manifested in both Economies. What the Father works in the Old, the Son still continues to perform in the New Covenant. Or to express it in that brief and pithy dictum of Our Saviour: "*My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*" (John v. 17).

In the first place, then, the New Testament writers use the language and phrases of the Old Testament, simply by way of metaphrasis. This is exemplified:

(1). In

Psalm VIII.

Ver. 1. To the chief musician on the Gittith,
A Psalm of David.
2. Jehovah our Lord,
How excellent is thy name over the whole earth,
Whose glory extends above the heavens.
3. From the mouth of babes and sucklings,
thou hast founded glory [to thyself],
Because of thine adversaries;
To silence enemy and avenger.
4. When I see thy heavens—the work of thy fingers—

[1] As Cosmos Indecopleustes says, with reference to the quotation from Deut. xxx. 12 in Rom. x. 6, μεταφρασει την χρῆσιν ως αρμοδιαν εις την ιδιαν υπυθεσιν, "He metaphrases the terms used as suitable to his own argument."

The moon and stars which thou hast prepared;[a]

[a] or, *fixed.*

Ver. 5. What is mortal-man, that thou shouldst remember him?
And the son of man, that thou shouldst visit him?

6. Yet thou hast made him a little less than Elohim,
And hast crowned him with honour and glory.

7. Thou hast made him rule over the works of thy hands;
All things hast thou put beneath his feet.

8. Sheep and oxen all,
And also the beasts of the field;

9. The fowls of the heavens, and the fish of the sea;
(Everything) passing through the paths of the sea.

10. Jehovah our God,
How glorious is thy name over the whole earth!

Ver. 2.—תְּנָה is taken by the Chaldee, דִּיהַבְתָּא זְנָךְ; Syriac, ; and by Jewish grammarians, as an irregular infinitive of נָתַן, to give, for the pret. נָתַתָּ, "*who hast given thy glory above the heavens.*" This, however, cannot be sustained by analogy. The inf. const. is never used for the finite verb.

Gesenius takes it as an imperative, "*which thy glory set thou also above the heavens.*" But the expression of such a desire is here out of place; the preceding and following show that the Psalmist is rather struck with amazement at the glorious manifestations of Jehovah.

We have, therefore, followed Ewald, who derives it from תָּנָה, Arab., ﺗَﻨَﺎ, (to dwell) or extend. It is the inf. cons., "WHOSE GLORY IS EXTENDED;" the genitive of the relative pron. being expresed in Hebrew by אֲשֶׁר, followed by the pron. suffix, as אֲשֶׁר זַרְעוֹ, "whose seed," Gen. i. 11; so אֲשֶׁר הוֹדְךָ, whose glory.

Ver. 3.—מִפִּי עוֹלְלִים וְיוֹנְקִים, "*from the mouth of babes and sucklings*," &c. From the instinctive recognition of thy being and glory, even by the youngest children, יָסַדְתָּ עֹז, "thou hast founded strength, *i. e.*, is a strong defence against those who would question thy being and obscure thy glory."

לְהַשְׁבִּית, inf. hiph. of שָׁבַת, *to silence;* De Wette, "*beschwichtigen;*" Aben Ezra, לְבַטֵּל דִּבְרֵי הַמַּכְחִישִׁים הָאֹמְרִים אֵין אֱלוֹהַ, "to frustrate the words of the atheists, who say, there is no God." The Sept. version, *κατηρτίσω αἶνον*, thou hast prepared praise, is adopted by Christ in his reply to the Pharisees (Matt. xxi. 16), which conveys the same idea, with a change of form.

Hofmann's suggestion, viz., "to render מִפִּי (by way of circumlocution) like לְפִי נַחֲלָתוֹ, Hos. x. 12, according to his inheritance, thus, "From the existence of the babes and sucklings, Jehovah founds power to himself," that is, "those who are born in a helpless condition are, nevertheless, growing up to be the instruments by which God conquers and subdues his enemies,"[1] does not well comport with what follows.

Ver. 5.—*When I see thy heavens, the moon and stars which thou hast prepared, then I* must exclaim *what is mortal?* אֱנוֹשׁ, "mortal," is the parallel of אָדָם, which reminds us of his origin, that he *was created;* עָפָר מִן־הָאֲדָמָה, dust from the ground (Gen. ii. 7).

Ver. 6.—וַתְּחַסְּרֵהוּ מְעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים, *And thou hast made him a little lower than Elohim.* אֱלֹהִים is an appellation common to God and angels. It expresses the superhuman state. The LXX version, *ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους*, Thou hast made him a little lower "*than angels*," which is retained in the New Testament (Heb. ii. 7), is, perhaps, the precise meaning of the Psalmist. It is, at all events, the rendering of the Chaldee, מִמַּלְאֲכַיָּא קְלִיל; Syriac, ; and Aben Ezra, who compares it with אֱלָהִין, Dan. ii. 11.

[1] Weissagung in Erfullung.

The allusion of the Psalmist is obviously to the original state of man; his being created in the image of God, with dominion over the inferior creation (Gen. i. 26, 28; ix. 2).

The contents of this Psalm lead us to suppose that David composed it on a beautiful starry night, when contemplating the splendour of the heavenly bodies, and the power and sublimity of Him whose mighty arm wields those vast and numerous orbs in their spheres. Wrapt in such lofty contemplations, he could not but remember with amazement the surpassing condescension and love of the omnipotent Ruler of the Universe, who has thus favoured the human race in elevating and ennobling it in the scale of existence.

Mortal man (אֱנוֹשׁ), the son of the earth (אָדָם), is a sort of Divinity (אֱלֹהִים), and ruler over the inferior creation.

Now, from this Psalm we have *two* quotations in the New Testament:—

a.) Verse 3 is quoted by our Saviour in reply to the Jews—

"When the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he (Jesus) did, and the children crying in the temple and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David, they were sore displeased, and said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus said unto them, Yea, have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected (prepared) praise? And he left them, and went out of the city," (Matt. xxi. 15-18).

The question presenting itself in connexion with this passage is, was it the intention of our Saviour, by

quoting this passage, to affirm that the Psalm bears particular reference to himself—in other words, that David, in composing this Psalm, saw in spirit his entry in Jerusalem, his triumphant reception in the temple—heard the Hosannas of the children?

It is easy to see that those who take this view of our Lord's reply are necessarily driven to do violence to this simple and sublime lyrical poem, by attaching to it another occult sense along with the obvious literal one. But do the words of our Saviour countenance such a construction? that is the question.

To this we must answer in the negative. We think that nothing was further from the intention of our Lord than to countenance a multiplicity of senses to one and the same Psalm. His words, when properly examined, will not justify such a conclusion. Let us then consider their sublime import:—

The high priest and scribes were filled with indignation and envy at the acclamations of the children, "Hosanna to the Son of David," and asked him, "Hearest thou what these say?" Our Lord, instead of giving them a reply *simpliciter*, meets these enemies with the same weapon with which he encountered his arch-fiend the tempter (Matt. iv.) And no passage of Scripture could have been so apposite, so strikingly fitted to silence them, as the 3rd verse of our Psalm.

"Have you never read, out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?" That is, "have you never read what the Psalmist said, namely, that God's being and glory is revealed even in the instinctive movements and lispings of babes, though the proud and the wise blaspheme and obscure his glory? even so, these children sing praises to me, the promised Saviour,

the Son of David, though you proud and conceited scribes blaspheme and dispute my claims."

Thus the reply is momentous, full of meaning and heavenly wisdom, and harmonizes with another declaration of our Lord, namely, "I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out," (Luke xix. 37-40).

To attach a double sense, then, to Psalm viii. 3 would, in our estimation, not only mar the beauty of the Psalm itself, but also divest the words of our Lord of all their force and majesty.

b) There is another quotation from this Psalm in the New Testament, namely, ver. 5-8 are quoted by Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews. In speaking of Christ's superiority to the angels, he says, "For unto the angels has he not put in subjection the *world to come*, whereof we speak. *But one in a certain place* testified, saying, What is man that thou art mindful of him?" &c.

"For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things under him, but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour," (Heb. ii. 5-9).

Here also we perceive, the Apostle only uses the words of the Psalmist as a substratum for the conveying of his own ideas: *What one says in a certain place* respecting the human race in general, is particularly applicable to Christ, *the son of man*, who came to restore to the human race the lost image of God, under whom not only sheep and oxen should be put in subjection, but principalities and powers—*the whole world to come*, yea, even death itself, (1 Cor. xv. 25-28).

The only difference is, that while the Psalmist presents it as a matter of pride and exultation in man, that he is only a little inferior to angels, the Apostle in applying the same phrase to Christ makes it a matter of humiliation, that he lowered himself, *i. e.*, took human nature for the suffering of death.[1]

It is needless to discuss the term מְעַט rendered by the Sept. *βραχύ τι*, for a little, or a short time, and followed by the Apostle, inasmuch as in both quotations referred to, the Sept. version is followed, being the most familiar to the persons to whom the words were addressed.

In the last quotation in particular, the Hebrew text is not essential to the Apostle's argument, as he changes the phrases altogether.

Those who wish to make this a direct Messianic quotation, have of course to answer for the difficulty of their own making, which they ingeniously do, by putting a double sense into the Psalm.

(2). A striking instance of the same class of references is presented in Psalm xix. ver. 4.

This Psalm celebrates the glory of God as revealed in the material world:

---

[1] Dr. Davidson, after disposing of different views of sundry commentators on this passage, says, "The words of David apply to the human nature of the Messiah and his people viewed in connexion. His people are said to be members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. The union is close, mysterious, and separable. Hence there is a reference to redeemed humanity in association with the Messiah, or the Messiah at the head of redeemed humanity. The humanity of Messiah joined to redeemed humanity is a glorious representation of the dignity belonging to man."—*Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 506.

This interpretation has the decided advantage of the others, which our author refutes, because it does not clog the passage with double meanings, and it moreover involves a truth which cannot be questioned. But we are disposed to question as to whether this be intended by the Psalmist. On the whole, our exposition recommends itself best to our judgment.

Ver. 1. To the Chief Musician. A Psalm of David.
2. The heavens tell the glory of God,
And the firmament declares his handy-work.
3. Day unto day pours forth speech,
And night unto night uttereth knowledge.
4. This is no speech, and no word whose voice is not heard.
5. Their sound has gone out in the whole earth,
And to the end of the world their words.
6. To the sun he hath set a tabernacle there,
Who as a bridegroom coming forth from his canopy,[1]
And rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race.
7. From the end of the heavens his rising,
And his circuit unto the ends thereof,
And nothing is hid from his heat.

This needs no comment. It would be only a waste of energy in seeking to comment upon this passage. It is plain enough that "*the sound*" and "*words*" refer to the language, which nature proclaims.

But the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans (x. 17, 18), in speaking of faith which is effected by the preaching of the word of God; proceeds as follows:

"But I say, have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words into the end of the world." Nothing can be more certain, than that, the Apostle Paul uses the saying of the Psalmist only as a fit illustration of the subject in hand; viz., What the Psalmist says respecting the universal voice of

[1] The Hebrew word חֻפָּה refers to the canopy which is erected for the celebration of the marriage-ceremony in the east, when the bridegroom is arrayed in all his splendour.

nature, may fitly be applied to the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, who sent out his disciples with the commission, "Go ye unto all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature (Mark xvi. 15), and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," (Matt. xxiii. 20), Comp. Acts i. 8. And yet some commentators are so partial to their theory of "*double sense*," that they would sacrifice that beautiful rhetorical turn, which St. Paul gives to the words of the Psalmist, to their favourite hypothesis, and actually extract from this Psalm also, a mystical sense in addition to the natural one.

(3). Another example of metaphrasis is afforded in Psalm xli.

The Psalmist complains against the malice of his enemies, who looked for his destruction; yea, even as to his friends he says:

Ver. 10. Even the man of my peace, whom I confided in,
Eating my bread, has lifted up the heel against me.

Now it is certain that this Psalm is not Messianic, as we read in

Ver. 5. I have said, Jehovah have mercy upon me;
Heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee.

And yet our Saviour himself applies ver. 10, to his betrayal by Judas: "I speak not of you all, I know whom I have chosen, but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, 'He that eateth bread with me, has lifted up his heel against me.' Now I tell you before it come,

that when it come to pass, ye may believe that I am he," (John xiii. 18, 19). Our Lord, we apprehend, meant nothing more by this quotation than to intimate, that what David says concerning his treacherous enemy Ahithophel, the same "*will be fulfilled*" with respect to Judas Iscariot.

"I tell you before hand, that he is about to commit that infamous deed, that when it come to pass you may know that I am the true Prophet."

Neither is this prophecy confined to the treason, but also to the consequences, and reward of the traitor. For Judas shared the fate of his prototype Ahithophel, who hanged himself. (1 Sam. xvii.) Thus our Lord in quoting the 10th verse of our Psalm, meant nothing more to indicate, than that he was about to be betrayed by one his disciple, like his father David, and that the traitor will meet with the same punishment as the traitor of David.

Some are apt to be misled by the formula *ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ*, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, with which our Lord introduces the quotation, thinking that the one must be a direct, or typical prophecy of the other. But that the formula in question does not necessarily imply such a reference, but in the same, like its cognate usus loquendi, *ὅτι πληρωθῇ*, Matt. ii. 17, will be apparent, when we consider its usage by the New Testament writers: *e. g.*

(4). We find that our Lord uses the same phrase in John xv. 25: "But this comes to pass that the word might be fulfilled (*ἵνα πληρωθῇ*), that is written in their law: They hated me without a cause."

And when we turn to the words of the Psalmist, they read thus: Psalm lxix:

Ver. 5. More than the hairs of mine head are they who hate me without a cause;
Numerous are my destroyers, who hate me wrongfully:
That which I have not robbed I must restore.
6. O God! Thou knowest my foolishness,
And my sins are not hid from Thee.

It hardly requires to be proved, that no direct reference is attached by our Lord, for ver. 6 cannot apply to Him who was sinless. Hence in comparing these two passages, we must come to the conclusion, that the phrase ἵνα πληρωθῇ, used by our Lord and his Apostles, must not be taken in a strict and limited sense, as if they meant to stamp it as a prophecy, but as a mere adaptation of one event to the other. Thus in the passage under consideration, it signifies the same, as if our Lord had said "that which is written in their law (taking this word in its comprehensive sense, *i. e.*, the Old Testament), is true in the present case."

(5). The foregoing remarks will enable us properly to understand another quotation from the same Psalm lxix. ver. 10.

The Psalmist is deeply mortified that he is noted and persecuted on account of his zeal for the service of Jehovah; he says,

Ver. 10. For the zeal of thine house has consumed me;
The revilings of thy revilers have fallen upon me.

When therefore the evangelist records, that the Saviour, inspired with zeal for the purity and sanctity of the temple, drove out them that sold oxen, sheep, and doves, and poured out the changers' money, he adds:

"And his disciples remembered that it was written; 'The zeal of thine house has eaten me up;'" that is, they remembered what was written of David as being so strikingly applicable to Christ, his Son and Lord.

The second hemistich is quoted in Rom. xv. 3, evidently in a similar sense.

(6). The last instance of the same class of quotations, we shall advert to is Psalm cxviii.

Ver. 22. The stones which the builders rejected
Has become the head of the corner.
23. From Jehovah is this,
It is marvellous in our eyes.

In addition to the whole burden of this Psalm, which speaks for itself, with respect to the occasion when it was composed, and subject to which it refers; we have a comment upon it in Ezra iii. 10, 11:

When the remnant of the Israelitish captives returned from Babylon, and by singular tokens of Divine favour, they were able to lay the foundation of the Temple of the Lord; then, the prophet tells us, they sung praises to God, in the very words which form the commencement of this Psalm.

But when we come to the New Testament, we find that our Lord himself in his parables asks the Pharisees:

"Did ye never read in the Scriptures, 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner?' Therefore, I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to nations bringing forth the fruit thereof," (Matt. xxi. 42, 43).

And the Apostle Peter says, more emphatically of Christ:

"This is the stone which is set at nought by you builders, which is become the head of the corner," (Acts iv. 10).

Here also we conceive, that neither Christ, nor his Apostle, put any recondite sense upon this phrase. All they meant to say, is, simply that the proverb of the Psalmist, finds in Christ its fit and striking application.

This then, we think to be the only consistent view of those Old Testament quotations in the New, which is borne out by sound principles of interpretation.

It will appear the more natural, when we bear in mind, that the Apostle Paul quotes also from profane authors, as Acts xvii. 28.

"As certain also of your poets, have said, For we are also his offspring" (*Φαινομενα* of Aratus). Also 1 Cor. xv. 33:

"Evil communications corrupt good manners," is taken from Meander's Thais. See also Titus i. 12,[1] which proves that the mere fact of the New Testament writers quoting certain passages, does not stamp them as Messianic predictions. The efforts, therefore, of commentators, to tether those passages in that direction, can have no other effect than marring their beauty in the original, and doing injustice to the New Testament writers.

We have thus concluded our remarks on the first class of the Old Testament quotations in the New, which we considered as simple metaphrasis.

Christ and his apostles, in reasoning with the Jews, use the language and phrases of the Old Testament (in

[1] See Davidson on Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 334, *seq.*

the vernacular version, the most familiar to their hearers), not because the phrases thus quoted are Messianic predictions, but merely as striking adaptations to the subject in hand; just as the apostles cite passages from heathen poets, or as we borrow the language of a writer with whom we are familiar for the conveying of our own thoughts.

It now remains for us to consider—

II. Another class of Old Testament quotations in the New, which, though originally bearing no direct reference to Christ, are still calculated to give us a deeper insight into the organic resemblance between the fundamental doctrines of the Old Testament and those of the New. In other words, they are (if we may use the term) *Messianic prophecies by implication*, or *Messianic inferences*; and under this head we consider—

(1). PSALM XL.

Ver. 1. To the chief musician, by David. A Psalm.
2. I waited, waited for Jehovah,
And he inclined unto me, and heard my cry;
3. And brought me up from the pit of destruction,
From the miry clay, and fixed my feet upon a rock, establishing my steps.
4. And he has put in my mouth a new song,
"Praise to our God!"
Many shall see it, and shall fear, and trust in the Lord.
5. Blessed is the man who has made Jehovah his trust,
And has not turned to proud (men), nor to swervers of falsehood.

Ver. 6. Great are thy wonders and thoughts, Jehovah my God,
Which thou hast done towards us!
None is like thee: I will declare and speak—but
They are too many to be numbered.
7. Sacrifice and offering thou desirest not;
My ears hast thou opened;
Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou hast not required.
8. Then I said, Lo! I come:
In the roll of the book it is prescribed to me.
9. To do thy will, my God, I delight;
And thy law (is) in my heart.

Ver. 2.—"*And he inclined unto me*," supply אָזְנוֹ, "*his ear*" (Jarchi). To enhance the importance of the deliverance, he describes the danger as—

Ver. 3.—The pit of destruction; Arabic version, مِنْ جُبِّ الْهَلَاكِ from the grave of death, or destruction. The Chaldee, Aben Ezra, and Ben Melech, take שָׁאוֹן in the same sense as Is. xvii. 12, 13, "the roaring" of mighty waters. So Luther, "Grube des Brausens."

"*Pit of destruction*" and "*miry clay*" form a contrast with סֶלַע, the rock where his feet are now fixed and established.

Ver. 4.—Many shall see, viz., the wonderful interposition of God, וְיִרְאוּ, and shall fear and trust in Jehovah. יְהוָה being the object of both predicates יָרֵא and בָּטַח; or יִרְאוּ itself may, like the Arabic تَقَرِي, imply Jehovah (יְהוָה) as its object.

Ver. 6.—אֵין עָרֹךְ אֵלֶיךָ, "*none is like unto thee*," or, as the Chaldee, לֵית אֶפְשָׁר לְסַדָּרָא לְוָתָךְ תִּשְׁבָּחָתָךְ, "*It is impossible to prepare* (adequate) *praises to thee;*" and Symm., οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκθεσθαι περί σου. They take עָרֹךְ in the same sense as Ps. v. 4. בֹּקֶר אֶעֱרֹךְ לְךָ, "*In the morning I direct my prayer unto thee.*"

Thus the Psalmist, urged by an inexpressible desire to utter his

praise, says, אַגִּידָה, *let me declare*, (with ה exhortative); he makes the attempt, but checks himself, "No! עָצְמוּ מִדַּבֵּר, they are past utterance—they are too many to be numbered."

Ver. 7.—He further contemplates the manner in which he could manifest the gratitude towards God which burns in his inward heart, and which no language can adequately express:—

Shall I render thee sacrifices for this glorious deliverance? זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה לֹא חָפַצְתָּ, *Sacrifice and offering thou desirest not.* חָפֵץ lit. means to have pleasure in. אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי, ears hast thou *bored to me, i. e.*, thou hast given me ears to hearken to thy voice and do thy will. The phrase כָּרָה אֹזֶן is expressive of obedience, like גָּלָה אֹזֶן and פָּתַח אֹזֶן. It may be compared to a similar description, Ps. cxxxix. 13-16:—

> "For thou possessest my reins
> Thou coverest me in my mother's womb.
> My frame was not hid from thee
> When I was made in secret,
> Embroidered in the depth of the earth."

So Job x. 10, 11:—

> "Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh,
> And hast fenced me with bones and sinews."

The same is said here by the Psalmist, that God has dug the labyrinth of his ears, for the hearing of his commandments. The Chaldee, לְאַצְתָא פּוּרְקָנָךְ כְּרִיתָ לִי אוּדְנִין, Thou hast digged ears for me, that I might perceive thy redemption; and the Sept. of Job xxxiii. 16, גָּלָה אֹזֶן, is ἀγακαλυπτειν νοῦν.

Ver. 8.—"Then I said, Lo I come, בִּמְגִלַּת סֵפֶר כָּתוּב עָלָי, *in the roll of the book it is prescribed to me.*" כָּתוּב עָלָי is like 2 Kings xxii. 13, לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּכָל הַכָּתוּב עָלֵינוּ, "*to do according to all it is prescribed to us*" (Michaelis, Stier, and Hengstenberg).

De Wette renders it, "*With the roll of the book* (viz., the law) *written upon me*," *i. e.*, upon my heart; making it a synonymous parallel with וְתוֹרָתְךָ בְּתוֹךְ כִּבְיָ, "*and the law in my heart.*" The antithetic parallel, when transposed, will read thus:—

> "Sacrifice and offering thou desirest not;
> Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou hast not required;
> Ears hast thou dug for me.
> Then I said, Lo, I come,
> With the law written upon me," &c.

We need not refer to ver. 13—

"For innumerable evils have compassed me about;
Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, that I cannot overlook them;
They are more numerous than the hairs of my head,
And my heart faileth me,"

to prove that this Psalm relates to David personally, and not to Christ, as the Messianic reference is excluded even by a correct rendering of ver. 6-9.

Yet, although internal evidences exclude a direct Messianic prediction from this Psalm, there is still one principle prominently and strikingly expounded in it, which leads us beyond the Mosaic institute to the doctrine of the all-sufficient atonement made by Christ in his expiatory death on the cross. This doctrine is implied in ver. 7—

"Sacrifice and offering thou desirest not,
Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou hast not required."

For, if it was known to the saints of the Old Testament that the Lord can have no pleasure (חָפֵץ) in the blood of bulls and goats, neither in the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, then it follows that they must have looked beyond it to that all-sufficient sacrifice of the new covenant, rendered to the justice of God's law in the death of Christ, their Saviour and ours.

This is the natural and legitimate conclusion to be deduced from the wonderful declaration of our Psalm.

The apostle Paul, therefore, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. x., in speaking of the sacrifices of the

Old Testament as being a mere shadow of good things to come, he puts into the mouth of Messiah before coming into the world[1] the words of ver. 7: "Sacrifices and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt-offering and sacrifices for sin thou hast no pleasure. Then I said, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, to do thy will, O God."

Thus the apostle, in adapting the language of the Sept. version,[2] builds his argument upon the declaration of the Psalmist, from which he makes his incontrovertible deduction that "JESUS CHRIST IS THE TRUE SACRIFICE, ONCE FOR ALL."

---

[1] "The apostle pictures to himself the manner in which the Messiah perceives the inefficiency of the ancient rite of expiation, who, entering into the counsel of the Father, resolves to come into the world himself, and reconcile it by his death. Thus Klopstock, in the Messiah:—

'Father, I saw their sorrows; thou my tears,
Then spakest thou: Let us anew in man
Create our image. Therefore he decreed
Our myst'ry, the blood of expiation:
The new creation of the sons of men,
Formed to our glorious and eternal image!
To perfect those for men, this act Divine
Myself I chose. To thee, eternal sire,
To all the countless hosts of heav'n 'tis known,
Since this resolve, how ardent my desire,
Man's low estate and nature to assume.'"

[2] The attempt of Kennicott and others to make some emendations in the Hebrew text in order to conform it to the Sept. version is one which we cannot call fortunate, as this is not the only place where the New Testament writers adopt the language of the Sept. when the latter depart from the Hebrew text. Besides, to

turn אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ, ears thou hast bored,
into אָז גְּוִיָּה כָּתַתָּ, then a body thou hast given,

is to mar the text by the emendation. For אָז גְּוִיָּה כָּתַתָּ is but wretched Hebrew; indeed, אָז is an adverb of time, and no conjunction, to signify *then*, or therefore. It always stands immediately before the verb, generally before the future, which is converted into the preterite. Why resort to such emendations, when the *sense* of the Sept. is just the same, viz., "I dedicate *myself* to do thy will," instead of, "I hear and do thy will?"

(2). The quotation from Psalm lxviii. may serve as an additional illustration of the principle just laid down, though it is somewhat different in its character. Here the inference is not immediately from the Psalm itself, but from the use which the apostle makes of it.

This is a triumphal song, occasioned by some signal victory. The very opening of the poem describes the victory as decisive and complete, as—

Ver. 2. God arises—his enemies are scattered.
Those hating him, flee before him.
3. As smoke is driven, thou drivest (them):
As wax is melted before the fire (so)
The wicked perish before God.

Then, after recounting the merciful dealings of Jehovah with his ancient people during several periods of their history—their march through the wilderness—the days of the judges—the establishment of the theocracy on Mount Zion, and its confirmation by the victory thus achieved—the Psalmist represents Jehovah, the leader of the theocracy, as returning to his throne on high with the spoils of the conquest—

Ver. 19. Thou hast ascended on high,
Thou hast captured a captivity,
Thou hast taken gifts among mankind,
Even rebels to dwell (with) Jah God!

The verb לָקַח denotes both to take and to give, as Gen. xxxviii. 6; xxxiv. 4; Exod. xxi. 10; xxv. 2; Judg. xiv. 3. And the import of the verse may be, that the conqueror has exacted gifts from his vanquished enemies, which gifts he distributes among his followers.

In this latter sense the verb is taken by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 8—

"Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."

But how does this triumph of God in the theocracy apply to the ascension of Christ?

"The principle of accommodation can have no place here, as the apostle reasons from these verses. Neither can we bring ourselves to the notion of typical allusion, or '*emblem*,' as Barnes terms it, as if the ark carried up to Zion was typical of Christ's ascent to heaven;[1] for we cannot convince ourselves that the ark is referred to in the Psalm at all."[2]

Now, in looking for some solution of this difficulty, the following recommends itself to our judgment, viz.—

The apostle, in reasoning from the words of this Psalm, evidently takes something for granted, which is this—that the same Jehovah who in the theocracy is represented as a leader of his victorious people, is the same who, under the new dispensation, after conquering his enemies, ascended on high, and bestows far nobler gifts to his believing disciples. Or, to use the language of the learned critic just quoted, "Jehovah of the theocracy was he who, in the fulness of time, assumed humanity, and what he did among his people prior to the incarnation was anticipative of nobler achievements in the nature of man."[3]

---

[1] This hypothesis rests upon the first line of the Psalm, which was used by Moses when the ark was moving. But it is evident that *victory* is the prevailing idea of our Psalm.

[2] Eadie on the Eph., p. 270. Compare our remarks, p. 34.

[3] Ibid., p. 271. See the whole subject fully discussed, p. 268 *seq.*

3. Psalm XCVII. 7.

Those who think the above exposition novel, let them refer, for a striking example, to Psalm xcvii.

In this Psalm, the universal sovereignty of Jehovah is described; whereupon, it is said—

Ver. 7. Shamed shall be all those serving graven images,
And boasting themselves in idols.
Bow down to him all ye angels.

The last clause is applied to Christ by the writer to the Hebrews (i. 6), "And again, when he bringeth in his first-begotten into the world, he says, And let all the angels of God serve him."

"And when he introduces, again, his first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let the angels of God worship him." This quotation, then, can denote nothing less than, "what is said by the Psalmist respecting God might be said of Messiah, his Son, through whom and in whom God established the theocracy;" at whose birth angels rejoiced and sung praises (Luke ii. 11, 13), and who, like his Father, makes angels his ministering servants (Matt. xiii. 41; xxiv. 13). For let it be borne in mind that the inspired apostles can never for a moment lose sight of that momentous fact which is the soul of both the New Testament and the Old, even the great mystery, "*God manifested in the flesh.*"

That the New Testament writers do not stand alone in their Divine ascriptions to Messiah, but that this belief was prevalent in the old dispensation, we need only refer to Dan. vii. 13, where the Son of Man is represented as "coming with the clouds of heaven."

4. Psalm XVIII.

Our attention has been directed to an examination of this Psalm, with respect to its Messianic character, by the recent publication of an admirable book on the subject.[1]

The commentary referred to, is replete with useful and interesting matter, and with the inculcation of Hermeneutical principles worthy of that eminent veteran expositor.

But we cannot go along with him in the interpretation of this Psalm as a direct and exclusive Messianic prophecy. We think that, while David celebrates in it his own victories and deliverances, מִכַּף כָּל אוֹיְבָיו, "*from the hand of all his enemies*," he still regards those exuberant kindnesses and Divine interposition on his behalf, as being bestowed, not for his own sake, but for the sake of that dynasty with respect to which he and his posterity are only links in the golden chain which extends to Messiah, to whom the eternal dominion belongs. In other words, David speaks of himself as the progenitor of Messiah. Hence he concludes that matchless epic poem—

Ver. 51. He that bestows great salvation upon his king,
And doing kindnesses to his anointed,
To David and his seed for ever.

As if to intimate that this was the clue to all his glorious deliverances and achievements. In this sense only we can regard it as a Messianic prophecy, and as being akin to the declaration of our Saviour himself, "*I*

[1] Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah, by Dr. J. Brown.

am the root and offspring of David;"[1] that is, he lies at the very foundation of David's government, as well as the illustrious descendant to whom all the promises bear reference. (Compare our introd. to the Psalms, p. 47.)

5. Psalm LXXXIX.

We would apply the foregoing remarks to this Psalm, to which we would ask particular attention, as it is of a piece with 2 Sam. vii. 12-17, or, rather, it is the same prophecy dilated in the form of a hymn for the service of the temple.

It is this prophecy chiefly which has given rise, and is the main support of the theory of "*double sense*."

David purposed the erection of a temple to the ark of God, whereupon the Lord sent the prophet Nathan with the mission, that the honour of building the house of God is not his, but was reserved for his son Solomon—

Ver. 13. He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever.

14. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men.

15. But my mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul whom I put away before thee.

16. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever.

Now, in what sense can the writer to the Hebrews

[1] Rev. xxii. 16.

(i. 6) apply the promise, "*I shall be his father, and he shall be my son,*" to Christ, to whom neither the preceding nor the following clause can possibly be applicable?

Of all the theories broached in explanation of this passage, Dr. Davidson's is the most scientific, and the only one worth noticing. He considers this prophecy an example of what he styles *commingling.* "This passage manifestly relates to Solomon, as both the occasion on which it was uttered, and the words themselves, clearly demonstrate. But that it also depicts the Redeemer may be inferred from Hebrews i. 5, where part of it is quoted and expressly applied to him. It is vain to deny the double reference of the passage; the *features of the type and the antitype being blended together.*"[1]

But without taking refuge in "*a double sense,*" or other precarious hypothesis—which have never been satisfactorily proved—we think the whole becomes perfectly clear when we apply to it the principle expounded in Psalm xviii., viz., the promises made to David regarding his son Solomon, that he should build the house of God, and moreover that, notwithstanding his backsliding, the sceptre of royalty shall not depart from him or from his posterity, as Saul forfeited it by his disobedience; these promises were given to him by virtue of that relationship which he bears to Messiah, the Son of God. And by virtue of that relationship only could Jehovah say of that Jewish prince, "*I will be his father, and he shall be my son.*"[2]

---

[1] Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 49.

[2] See our introductory remarks to the Psalms, p. 47.

There is thus a clear Messianic promise in this Psalm, but a promise without multiplicity of senses; a promise where Messiah—the root and branch of Jesse's dynasty —is the beginning, middle, and end of the whole; as he is, indeed, to be found not only in detached portions of the Jewish oracles, but is the foundation of all promises given to that nation, whether relating to things temporal or spiritual.

Index of Authors and Works referred to.

Abarbanel, 27.
Aben Ezra, 3; and in several other places.
Addison; Spectator, xxvii.
Alexander (Dr. W. L.); Connexion of the Old and New Testament, lxxviii.
———————— his translation of Hävernick's Einl. xvi.
Alexander (Prof. Joseph Addison); Commentary on Isaiah, xvi.
Alshuch, 41.
Aquila, 52, 64, 81, 83.
Aristotle; Poetic, i, viii.
Asaria (Rabbi), xi.

Bacon; Novum Organum, l.
Bade; Christologie, 31.
Bal Haturim, 35, 39.
Barnes; Philological Grammar, xxvii.
Bechai (Rabbi), 27.
Berthold, 20.
Ben Melech, 3, 69.
Bloomfield, 21, 34.
Bomberg's Bible, 81.
Brown (Dr. John); Commentary on Galatians, 22.
———————— Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah, 146.
Butler; Lectures on Imitative Art, i.

Calvin; Commentary, 36, and in several other places.
Candlish (Dr.); Lecture on Maurice's Theological Essays, xlv.
Capellus, v.
Carpenter (Dr.); Human Physiology, lv.
Carpzov, v., ix.
Carson, li.

Cicero; Pro Archia Poeta Oratio, xliv.
——— De Natura Deorum, xlviii.
Clarke (Dr. S.); Commentary, 87.
Confucius, lxxx.
Cosmos Indecopleustes, 125.
Cosri, xi.

Dathe, 41, 61.
Davidson (Dr. S.); On Sacred Hermeneutics, lxxii, 124, and in several other places.
———————— Treatise on Biblical Criticism, xiv, 72, 82, 84.
———————— Introduction to the New Testament, 100.
———————— Letter to the Author, 82.
Davison; Discourses on Prophecy, l, 43.
Delitzsch; Bibl. Proph. Theologie, lxi.
——— Bibl. Die Genesis, 7, 13, and in several other places.
De Rossi, 81.
De Wette; Comm. über In Psalmen, xi, 67, and in several other places.
Deutsche Zeitschrift, lix.

Eadie (Dr. J.); Lecture on Inspiration, lxi, lxii.
———————— Cyclopædia, 69.
———————— Commentary on Ephesians, lxxiv, 144.
Eichhorn, 60.
Eisenmenger; Entdecktes Judenthum, 4, 54, 111, 112.
Emek Habacha, 54.
Ernesti, 72.
Ewald; Die Poet. Bucher des Alten Test, xi, 67, and in several other places.
Eusebius, iv.

Freitag, 82.

Gaussen; Theopneustia, lxvi.
Gaon (Rabbi Sadja), 99, 121.
Gesenius, 9, 32; and in several other places.
Gilfillan; Bards of the Bible, xl.
Göethe, vii, xv.
Gomarus, v.
Grotius, 87, 104, 116.

Haller (Albr. von); Die Alpen, xxv.
Hare (Bishop) on Hebrew Metre, v.
Hävernick's Introduction to the Old Testament, 49.
Henderson (Dr. Eb.), On Isaiah, lxxiv.

Henderson (Dr. Eb.); On Inspiration, lviii, lxxiv; and in several other places.
Hengstenberg; Christologie and Psalms, referred to in several places.
Herder; Geist D. Hebr. Poesie, xi, xv, xxiv, 52.
——— Vom Studium der Theologie, 32.
Hesiod, lxxxi.
Hieronymus, iv, 48.
Hitzig, Psalmen, 77.
Hofman; Weissagung u. Erfüllung, 20, 27, 30.
Homer; Iliad, xviii, 25.
——— Odyss, xix, xxxix, xlviii, 27.
Horace, iii, 52, 53.
Horne (Bishop); Psalms, 69, 101.
Horsley (Bishop); Sermons, 69, 97, 101.
Hufnagel, 61, 68, 79, 120.
Humboldt (W. von); Kavi Sprache, ii, viii.

Jacob of Odessa, 108
Jahn; Vatic. Mess., 28.
Jalkut Shimoni, 39, 116.
Jarchi (Rabbi S.), 27; and in several other places.
Jones (Sir W.), vi.
Joseph (Rabbi), iii.
Josephus, iv.
Journal of Sacred Literature, edited by Dr. Burgess, lix.

Isaac (Rabbi), 103.

Keil, 77, 115.
Kennicott, 82.
Kimchi (Rabbi, D.), 25, 47; and in several other places.
Kitto (Dr.); Cyclopædia of Bibl. Lit., 85.
Knapp's Lectures on Theology, xlix, lxiv.
Koppe, xvi.
Köster, 77.
Koran, 25.
Künoel, in Vatic. Mess.; in several places.

Lee (Dr. S.); Hebrew Lex., 29, 32, 64.
——— On the Study of the Sacred Scriptures, lxxiii, 90.
Le Clerc, 36.
Lessing, Laocoon, ii, etc.
Lengerke, 77.
Longinus, xviii.
Lowth (Bishop); Hebrew Poetry, v, viii, xv.
——— Mystical Allegory, lxxi.

Lowth (Bishop); Notes on Isaiah, x, xiv.
Luther, lxi, 64.

Macaulay; Essays, ii, xvii.
Maimonides, 40, 49.
Masora, 81
Meibom, v.
Mendelsohn, 53, 64, 65, 69.
Michaelis (J. D.); Critisches Collegium der drei wichtisgsten Psalmen, *viz.*, xvi, xl, and Psalm cx., p. 66, etc.
Michaelis (J. H.); in Hagiographos, 92, 93, 102, etc., etc.
Michlal Jophi, 97; and in several other places.
Milton, his imitation of Hebrew Paranomasia, xxii.
——— quoted, 6.
Morison (Rev. J.); Lectures on the ix. chap. of the Rom., lvi.
Müller; Geschichte der Griech. Lit.,viii, xxxix.
Münster; Religion der Carthager, 14.

Nays; Translation of Psalms, 64.

Oben Tybon (Rabbi J.), xi.
Öhler; Prolegomena, 49.
Olshausen (Justus); Die Psalmen erklart, in several places.
Origen, iv.
Ovid, xlix.

Palfrey (Dr. J. G.); Lectures, lxxiv.
Pesikta Rabetha, 37.
Philo, li, 37.
Pindar, 116.
Pocock, 56.
Plato, xlviii.
Pope; Translation of Homer, xviii.
——— His Art of Criticism.

Rosenmüller; Scholia, 5; and in several other places.

Sack; Apologetik, 49.
Saalschütz, v.
Samaritan; Reading of Hebrew, xi.
———— their hope for Messiah, lxxx.
Scaliger, xi.
Schiller; Huldigung der Künste, iv.
Schlegel (Fr. von); Dram. Lit. xxviii.
Schlottman; Translation of Job, 69.
Schmitt Uroffenbarung, lxxx.

Schultens; Job, 3, 67, 68.
Septuagint version consulted.
Shakspeare, xxxix.
Simon, xi.
Smith (Dr. Pye); Scripture Testimony to Messiah, lxii, 9, 46, 99.
Sountag, vi, 9.
Stier; Seibzig auserwählte Psalmen von Christo, 56; and in several other places.
Stuart (Professor M.); Biblical Repository, lxi, lxx, lxxiv, 83.
——— Canon, 104.
Sykes, lxxvii.
Symmachus, 117.
Syriac version; consulted.

Targum; Jerusalem
Targum; Jonatham } consulted.
Targum; Onkelos
Talmud, 28.
Theodore of Mopsuesta, 87.
Theocritus, 96.
Tholuck; On Inspiration, lix.
——— Comm. on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 61, 117.
——— Old Testament in the New, 48, 105, 125.
Thomson; Seasons, 118.
Tregelles (Dr. S. P.), lii, lxii.

Umbreit, 88.

Vaihinger, 77.
Venema; Comm. in Psalmos; in several places.
Virgil, lxxxii.
Vitringa; On Isaiah, xlvi.
Vossius (J. H.); Version of Homer, xi, xix.

Walton; Polyglott.
Williams (Dr.); Principles of Medicine.
Wilson (Dr.); Land of the Bible, xi.

Zemech; David, 36.
Zendavesta, 4.
Zohar, 4.
Zoroaster, lxxxi.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Index of Bible Passages explained.

	Page
Gen. iii. 14, 15	2
Gen. iv. 1	8
Gen. ix. 20-28	12
Gen. xii. 1-3	19
Gen. xlix. 8-12	24
Numb. xxiv. 16, 17	33
Deut. xviii. 15-18	38
2 Sam. vii. 12-17	147
2 Sam. xxiii. 1-6	45
Psalm ii.	50
Psalm viii.	125
Psalm xvi.	62
Psalm xviii.	146
Psalm xix.	131
Psalm xxii.	73
Psalm xl.	138
Psalm xli.	133
Psalm xlv.	93
Psalm lxviii.	143
Psalm lxix.	135 & 136
Psalm cx.	114
Psalm cxviii.	136
Matt. xvi. 18	l
Matt. xxi. 15-18	128
Matt. xxi. 42, 43	136
John xiii. 18, 19	134
John xv. 25	134
Acts ii. 14	71
Rom. x. 17, 18	132
Eph. iv. 8	144
Gal. iii. 16	21
2 Tim. iii. 14-17	lii
Heb. i. 6	145
Heb. ii. 5-9	130
Heb. x.	141
2 Pet. i. 19, 20	liii

Psalm LXXII

166

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

43784

232.12L
W832

AUTHOR

TITLE Messiah /Wolfe

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

43784 232.12L W832